

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLVIII, No. 10
WHOLE No. 1211

December 10, 1932

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	221-224
EDITORIALS	
The Church and Labor—Looting the Republic	
—Lawless Youth—The Senator and the Soviets	
—The Garner Amendment—"Al" Smith....	225-227
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
A Plan for Articulate Laymen—Asthere—	
"He Stopped Thinking"—Hard-Headed	
Holiness	228-234
EDUCATION	
The Retarded Child.....	234-235
SOCIOLOGY	
Lawless Law in the Mooney Case.....	235-237
BACK OF BUSINESS	237
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF.....	238-239
POETRY	
Which?—Fragment 3.....	237; 239
LITERATURE	
The Irish Academy of Literature.....	240-241
REVIEWS	241-243
COMMUNICATIONS	244

Chronicle

Home News.—The last session of the Seventy-second Congress opened on December 5. Most of the activity preceding this event centered around negotiations among legislative leaders concerning the handling of Prohibition reform. The movement finally crystallized around Speaker Garner's resolution for repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Under suspension of rules, it was agreed that a vote would be taken on the first day of the session, and the Democratic whips reported to Mr. Garner that there would be a vote by a two-thirds majority in the House, thus forestalling the possibility of a threatened Presidential veto. Under this plan, the bill to modify the Volstead Act so as to allow beer with a higher percentage of alcohol would be temporarily postponed, but action would be taken on it following the vote on the Amendment. The principal work before the short session was the making of appropriations for Government operation for the fiscal year ending June, 1934, together with deficiency bills for the present fiscal year. Farm relief and the Philippine Independence bill were two other measures on which a vote was expected, but these two measures, together with modification of the Volstead Act, were threatened by the President's veto. Bonus legislation and relief appro-

priations were also expected to come forward, and the revival of the demand for a manufacturers' sales tax was apparent. Senator Smoot and, it was rumored, President Hoover were in favor of this tax.

At his retreat at Warm Springs, Ga., Governor Roosevelt received a succession of leaders in the country for the purpose of formulating a legislative plan to redeem his campaign pledges. At a meeting with farm leaders, it became clear that he was swinging more and more in favor of the domestic-allotment plan, to which he had alluded in his Topeka speech. He was reported as being in favor of a sharp reduction in the appropriations for naval building, a stand which immediately encountered sharp opposition from the so-called "big-navy" men. The Governor also was reported to be in favor of measures looking to a reduction of interest rates on farm mortgages. These conferences seemed to point to a special session after the inauguration, for, though Mr. Roosevelt had tacitly the leadership of the Democratic party, it was unlikely, due to the unstable balance in both Houses, that the Democrats would be able to bring about any of the changes sought by them.

Large bodies of men and women were converging on Washington in a movement planned and directed by the Communists. Special precautions were taken in Washington to prevent mass demonstrations, a parade to the Capitol, and a drain on the charitable resources of the city. Violence, however, was greatly feared. At the same time, a Farmers' National Relief Conference was called for December 4, to bring 350 to 500 farmers to Washington. There was apparently no Communistic affiliation in this second movement. Each member of the Conference was certified as a bona fide farm owner or dispossessed farmer, and each was elected by twenty-five of his neighbors.

Argentina.—On November 26, it was announced by Finance Minister Alberto Hueyo that the Government had engaged Sir Otto Niemeyer, vice-governor of the Bank of England, to act in the capacity of adviser on economics and finance. The establishment of a central bank and the reformation of the monetary system of Argentina were among the questions which Finance Minister Hueyo was prepared to submit to Sir Otto for solution.—Despite opposition of the business men who favored a moratorium, the Government on November 26 cabled funds to its embassy in Washington to pay \$1,578,375 on its foreign debt.

Hunger
March

English
Financial
Adviser

Australia.—After delays, the Commonwealth Parliament finally ratified the trade agreements within the Empire made at the Ottawa Conference. Amendments were offered by the former Prime Minister, J. H. Scullin, on behalf of the Labor party, and by Earle Page, of the Country party, but both were rejected. While adopting the British preferential scheme, the Government carried through an increase in the general tariffs.

Austria.—The economic situation remained desperate with little sign of immediate relief, though the League of Nations had reported favorably on the need of help for Austria. The large industries were stifled, the wages distributed throughout the nation were only half of what they were last year, and inventories showed stock shrinkage below any former level, with buying power almost wiped out.—An organization of Catholic leaders launched a movement to utilize the legitimate stage in upbuilding morale and in popularizing Christian ideals. Splendid success rewarded the initial efforts.

Bolivia.—A new and entirely unexpected development in the Chaco war was brought to light on November 28, when the Paraguayan Minister of War announced that the Bolivians began to concentrate their forces at Fort Camacho, which had been previously abandoned by them. This was taken to indicate that the Bolivians were preparing a new offensive in the North designed to draw back the Paraguayan forces. The thirty-first day of the battle for the possession of Fort Saavedra began on November 28 and found the Bolivians still securely entrenched in their position, despite the heavy artillery fire of the Paraguayans.

France.—The Franco-Soviet non-aggression pact, tentatively agreed to by both nations more than a year ago, but delayed by Russia's controversy with Rumania, was signed in Paris by Premier Herriot and Ambassador Dovgalesky on November 29. The treaty offered long-discussed advantages to both nations, Paris agreeing not to participate in any international movement designed to effect a partial or total commercial blockade of Russia, and Moscow promising to put an immediate check upon all Soviet propaganda in France. The military clauses of the document were of great interest in European capitals. After confirming the Kellogg anti-war pact, the treaty explicitly recognized the territorial integrity and sovereignty of both nations and bound them not to resort to arms against each other. The document also created a board of conciliation to meet once a year and to advise both Governments on matters of dispute between them. The treaty was vigorously attacked by all the Right newspapers in France on the score that it was not backed by sanctions and that the Paris officials had betrayed an alarming naïvete in trusting the good faith of the Soviets.

Even *Le Temps*, a Left organ, admitted that the value of the treaty "depends upon the way it is executed and the Soviets must be watched to make sure the agreement is respected." A newspaper controversy was precipitated by the signing of the treaty, anti-Government journals insisting that the full text was not being disclosed, and the official press asserting that the treaty was an important instrument of stability in Europe and a complete offset to the Soviet accord with Germany. Meanwhile negotiations were being reopened in Paris towards the signing of a commercial treaty between the two nations. Heavy purchases of Soviet oil by the French revived interest in this proposed treaty, although observers insisted that the difficult problem of the Russian pre-revolutionary debts, totaling \$600,000,000 and repudiated by the Soviets, would again prove an insuperable obstacle to any such treaty.

Germany.—Confusion still marked the political situation in Germany. President von Hindenburg neglected no possible means of finding a solution of the *impasse* which tied up Government functioning according to the Weimar Constitution. The need of support of the Reichstag for a workable Cabinet and Government was recognized on all sides; but the passionate enthusiasm with which each faction clung to its own solution of the national chaos prevented a majority combination.

After Herr Hitler rejected the conditions laid on him for assuming power, the President turned to Dr. Ludwig Kaas of the Centrist party, who failed utterly to secure a working agreement, as the Nationalists were set against any attempt at parliamentarianism, and the Nazi leaders would accept no one but Hitler as Chancellor. As a last effort, President von Hindenburg summoned the recognized power behind the last Government, Gen. Kurt von Schleicher, Minister of Defense and head of the Reichswehr, to negotiate a truce from factional politics during the present Winter. Hitler failed to keep an important engagement with Von Schleicher to discuss the new proposition, which was supposed to remove friction because the General was the only member of the former Cabinet respected by the Hitlerites. His program excluded any radical changes at present, all attention being focused on unemployment and domestic economic problems, while it was understood that the foreign policy must be maintained. In the event of failure of General von Schleicher to reach an accord guaranteeing parliamentary support of a new Cabinet, it was expected that the President would drop negotiations and form a presidial Cabinet with either Von Schleicher or Von Papen at the head.

Business was said to be lagging because of uncertainty in selecting a Cabinet, but the stock and bond market went up when it was reported that General von Schleicher was active in seeking a solution. The general impression seemed to be that business and industry would be satisfied with any neutral Cabinet in preference to the last one under Chancellor von Papen. Gold in the Reichsbank

Agreements
Ratified

Financial
Stagnation

Surprise Move
in North

Soviet
Treaty

Confusion
Continues

Von Schleicher
Active

Economics;
Unemployment

showed increase, though far below the high of last January. The ratio of reserve to outstanding notes was 28.2 per cent.—The Winter was increasing the burden of unemployment, figures showing 156,000 more unemployed than at the end of October.

Honduras.—On November 29, General Fonseca, head of the rebel army operating around Tegucigalpa, sent an ultimatum to President Carias demanding the surrender of the city within fifteen hours under threat of attack. The President, however, refused to surrender and challenged the rebels to take the city. Reports of November 30 stated that heavy fighting had started near Sauce.

India.—A recommendation that the trade agreements with the United Kingdom made at the Ottawa Imperial Conference be ratified for a period of three years was made by the special committee of the Legislative Assembly. The report was accepted and the agreements ratified.

Two major reasons were alleged for ratification: first, that the exclusion of India from the benefit of British preferences would cause a loss of the greater part of the market now held by India; second, the tariff policies of foreign countries were such that there was no immediate hope of increasing trade outside the Empire. A period of three years, instead of five, was assigned as adequate to give experience of actual results.

Ireland.—Upon the advice tendered to King George by President De Valera, on November 26 Donal Buckley was named the third Governor General of the Irish Free State. Mr. Buckley, a resident of Maynooth, County Kildare, was a shopkeeper until his recent retirement from business. He was a participant in the Easter rebellion of 1916, and though he always remained an ardent Republican, he was never particularly prominent among the leaders. His appointment was a surprise, for he was never mentioned previously among those who were likely nominees for the post. He took the oath of allegiance before Chief Justice Kennedy on the date of his appointment. A newspaper dispatch stated that his title would be changed from Governor General to that of Seneschal. Also, that he would not occupy the official residence of the Governor General, the Viceregal Lodge, Phoenix Park, but would take a private house near Dublin. Mr. Buckley succeeded, as Governor General, James McNeill, whose resignation was accepted by the King on October 31 after a series of disagreements with the Fianna Fail Government.

Possibilities of a grave situation arose with the announcement that the Railway Wage Board had ordered a cut of ten per cent in wages beginning December 31. Meeting of railway employees in various parts of the country denounced the reductions, and threats were made of calling a general strike of railwaymen.—According to one

of AMERICA's correspondents, the tariff war with England wrought havoc with the Irish trade. Money was scarce so that there was little buying. The cattle trade and that of agricultural products had practically collapsed under the heavy duties in England. The Government offered bounties upon exports equaling the amounts leveled through duties; according to the correspondent, it is unsound that "we should actually pay our exporters what they, in their turn, have to pay to the British Government so that the British treasury can recoup the sums (from annuities) unpaid by us." This method, he continued, would tend to smash the Free State economic system, a thing which some declared President De Valera wished. "But that is doubtful," he stated. "Mr. De Valera does certainly desire to substitute home-grown foodstuffs for imported foodstuffs, to substitute an arable for a pastoral agriculture, and to conserve the home market for home farmers and manufacturers. It is certain that he does not desire a Communist State such as some of his critics and a large number of his admirers suggest and believe."

Japan.—On November 30, the Japanese press announced that the yen had reached an all-time low mark when it dropped to 19½ cents. The press last week had sensed this fall of the yen in its criticism of the large budget which was approved by the Government in the face of the persistent warnings from influential and financial interests. The Finance Minister stated the Government had acted to halt the fall of the yen, but did not reveal what measures had been taken.

Manchukuo.—On December 1, it was reported that the Japanese cavalry and infantry, several thousand strong, had opened an offensive against the forces of General Su Pinwen, leader of the revolt west of Tsitsihar, and had advanced more than a hundred miles toward the Northwest into enemy territory. It was claimed by the Japanese that the enemy had retreated before the rapid advance of the attack without offering any strong resistance to the Japanese forces. The frozen, snow-covered plains facilitated the rapid sweep of the cavalry and trucks.

Russia.—With ever-increasing food shortage at home, for which, as usual, the blame was laid upon "kulaks" (prosperous farmers), speculators, and other undesirable, the Soviet Government reported progress in the field of foreign relations. Announcement was made that the completion of the non-aggression treaty with France would be followed by improved relations with Nanking, Geneva, and Washington. Washington authorities, however, denied all basis to the last-mentioned item. On November 28, Leon Trotsky, exiled Bolshevik leader, spoke from Copenhagen on his favorite theme of the "permanent revolution," over a world broadcast. Difficulties in transmission, however, added to the obscurity of much of his language.

Disarmament.—Uncertainty of political conditions at home placed a damper on progress in the disarmament conference at Geneva. Premier Herriot of France was taken up by the debts discussions, which imperiled his own position. Norman Davis, the American representative, could offer little definite, with the defeat of President Hoover. The German delegation had no Government at home to look to for support; which may have encouraged them in taking a more conciliatory attitude on the matter of arms equality. In the meanwhile, cables were sent on November 25 by the League of Nations Council to Bolivia and Paraguay and the Commission of Neutrals urging an early truce in the Chaco field of battle.

Little
Progress

League of Nations.—The Council decided on November 28 to transmit the Lytton report on Manchuria and the minutes of its session to the Assembly, which was formally convoked for December 6, under Article XV of the Covenant. Yosuke Matsuoka, Japan's representative, although he objected to the Assembly being called under Article XV, expressed himself in favor of the matter being discussed by that body. Eamon De Valera, President of the Council, thanked the Lytton Commission, and asked its members to be ready should further information be needed upon matters contained in their report. This was over the protest of M. Matsuoka, who took the position that the Commission, having reported, no longer existed. The Council then decided to send to the Governments a draft of the model code for narcotics, drawn up for administration at the 1921 convention limiting manufacture and controlling distribution. A telegram from the "Federation of All Moslems of China" urged the League to save Manchuria from the Japanese. Talk was current at Geneva of a "conciliation committee," to be composed of the Assembly's Committee of Nineteen, the United States, and Soviet Russia, to which the Assembly might refer the task of pacifying China and Japan; but nothing definite was reported as to the scheme.

Lytton
Report

War Debts.—Statements by President-elect Roosevelt, subsequent to his conversation with President Hoover, brought out that his proposed dealing with each debtor separately, instead of through a commission, would exemplify the President's power of negotiation with foreign countries. No change appeared in the attitude of Congress, whose prominent members continued to register protest against postponements.

President
and Congress

Notes were sent, in reply to their communications, to Great Britain, France, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. The language in the various notes was substantially the same, but the press, at home and abroad, was quick to seize upon the significant difference in stress in the British note, which left some opening, apparently, for the presentation of further data, with the more unyielding phraseology

Nations
Notified

applied to France. All these nations were informed that they had failed to present convincing reasons why they could not meet their obligations on December 15; also that references to the Lausanne reparations agreement did not apply. On November 30 the British Cabinet approved the terms of a reply, which Premier MacDonald issued, and which was delivered on December 1. Main points therein were: (1) debt payments would deepen the world depression, and losses thereby cannot compare with present disaster; (2) the debt burden falls on the British in the form of sterling; (3) de facto, debts and reparations are connected, and the Lausanne agreement would be nullified; (4) the unnatural transfers would bring economic disaster, and further restrictions on American trade would be necessary to safeguard British exchange; (5) discussion would be fruitful, and there was now a special opportunity for the two great nations to cooperate.

Abroad, caution succeeded dismay. The French saw the ruin of the Lausanne agreement, which had been made dependent on American debt reductions. The British bewailed the Balfour generosity to their own debtors; while they were sensitive to the imputation of a "united front" with France. Premier Herriot feared falling if he insisted upon payment, and stalled off parliamentary debates, as did Mr. MacDonald, where it was urged in London by George Lambert. Neither nation would assert that they *could* not, or that they *would* not pay, though the British feared they would have to pay in gold bars, contrary to their usual custom.

Foreign
Opinion

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States advised, on November 26, temporary postponement of the collections, and approved of negotiations for modifications if the basis of payment were found changed. Such modifications, however, should be conditioned upon trade concessions and reductions in armament expenditures. Cancellation, however, should be rejected. French opinion, however, was opposed to "bargaining" in either the tariff or the armament field. The International Chamber of Commerce stated at Paris on November 30 that no solution could be reached by merely monetary measures.

Chamber of
Commerce

Since he first wrote in these columns about Matt Talbot, of Dublin, Francis Talbot, of New York, has uncovered more that has been written and done about that extraordinary man. He will write it out for next week's issue, in "Matt Talbot's Progress."

De Mille has shown New York a spectacular motion-picture production of an old favorite, "The Sign of the Cross." Gerard B. Donnelly will write next week about its good and bad points.

John Gibbons will tell a true story next week about his commander in the War. It will be called General Praise-God's Great Joke."

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1932

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRED PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
GERARD B. DONNELLY

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN
Associate Editors

JOHN LAFARGE
JAMES F. DONOVAN

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Medallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

A copy of the Index for Volume XLVII of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The Church and Labor

THE American Federation of Labor will perform a real service for its members, if it publishes the address made at its convention by the Archbishop of Cincinnati, and recommends it for careful study. Not for many years, if ever in its history, has the convention listened to a more stirring appeal to all workers to band together for their common good, and for the good of the community.

It need hardly be said that the Archbishop based his appeal on the grounds of justice and charity. Applying to the distressing conditions of the present day the principles set forth in the Encyclicals of Leo XIII and of Pius XI, Archbishop McNicholas concluded that "the old order must give way, not by its destruction as Communism urges, but by abolishing its abuses, and by establishing a reign of legal and social justice." Communism is a far greater danger than many in this country realize. It will grow stronger unless we seriously undertake to abolish the many abuses in the social and economic order which at times seem to condone, if not to justify, its excesses.

Following the teaching of Pius XI, Archbishop McNicholas selects three lines along which reform must be undertaken. In the first place, "riches must not remain in the hands of a few." When the relations of capital and labor are "determined according to the laws of strictest justice, called commutative justice, supported, however, by Christian charity," as Pius XI teaches, a wider and more equitable distribution of earthly commodities will effectively hinder the flow of wealth into a few channels. In the next place, the control of credit by small groups whose members can cut off at will "the life blood of the whole economic body," must be prohibited. Finally, the State must take effective measures against the "limitless free competition" the result of which is, as the Archbishop well said, that "a few men possessing great wealth,

and the power which goes with such wealth, become in our democratic country, economic dictators." Nor are these men satisfied with dictatorship in the economic field, since, in order to secure that control against attack, they must enter the political arena, "demoralizing Government agencies, and making them subservient."

It would be idle to assert that these evils can have no real place in this country. The fact is, as has often been pointed out in these pages, that there are few countries in the world where they are so deeply rooted. Our industrial history for more than half a century has been a history of oppression through insufficient wages and the insecurity of the workers' job, culminating at regular intervals by strikes, and by industrial disturbances which not infrequently are marked by murderous strife. To deny the reality of the social and economic evils at work in this country, is to be blind to the evidence of the facts before us.

Organized labor can do nothing better for its own and for the common welfare than to adopt a program of reform based on the social and economic principles taught by Leo XIII and Pius XI. In the Church labor has always found its best friend and its safest leader. In her official pronouncements, labor finds its Magna Charta. She alone can give labor and capital a policy that is progressive and beneficent, because it is founded on respect for rights wherever they exist, and on charity for all.

Looting the Republic

THE school days of those among us who have turned life's first half century, knew a custom which died not many years ago from overwork. For every local abuse we sought a parallel in the history of Rome, but if that rich mine failed us, as now and then it did, we were sure to find what we wished in the chronicles and instances of Greece. Not even Cicero himself put more force and pathos into his *o tempora, o mores* than the schoolboys of the 'eighties, when they moaned the degeneracy of the times in the elocution class on Friday afternoon. Nor were their elders above the custom; indeed, it had been begun by them, and they were loath to relinquish it. In those days, few political speeches, or editorials, ended without the warning that as Greece and Rome fell, so we by neglecting the pristine virtue of the Fathers would also fall.

The custom is returning, and it was aptly used a few weeks since by Dr. Samuel Harden Church, president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology at Pittsburgh. Dr. Church observes that one cause of the fall of the Roman Empire was a soldiery which first defended the Empire, and then, when its insatiable demands could not be satisfied, put the Empire on the block, and sold it to the highest bidder. He finds a parallel to that cause at work in the United States: the demand for the bonus, ceaselessly fostered by military associations at work in Congress, and throughout the country.

But Dr. Church's parallel is not exact. The soldiers who put the Empire on the block acted as a body, and there were few, if any, dissenters. The former soldiers

who have stated their determination to make the bonus the first business of Congress, no matter what the needs of the country may be, do not fairly represent the great body of men who enlisted or were drafted in 1917, and the following year. They are but a noisy minority. Still, it would be unwise to minimize Dr. Church's warning. A noisy minority always has its way against a silent majority, and some of the plans now urged by the minority do not stop short of looting the Republic.

Lawless Youth

A FEW weeks ago, four young men appeared before a New York court to be sentenced to death for murder. At the time the crime was committed, the youngest was a lad of seventeen, and the oldest was but twenty-two. "A typical neighborhood gang," the police reported, and with that comment, and the sentence of the court, the case was closed.

If such gangs are "typical," it would appear that our municipalities have failed to solve problems far more serious than any connected with franchises and finance.

Yet, apparently, the average American city is seriously concerned with the needs of youth. It provides schools at which attendance is compulsory. It spends large sums of money for supervised playgrounds and recreational centers. It encourages the formation of brigades and troops for boys, and some cities make generous appropriations, of doubtful legality, for summer camps so that the boys and girls from the slums may have facilities for healthful recreation during the hot months. But with all this effort, paralleled, and not infrequently surpassed, by the efforts of private associations for the welfare of the young, crime increases among our boys and girls. Records gathered by the United States Bureau of Investigation show that nearly forty per cent of prisoners fingerprinted during the last eight months were under twenty-four years of age. Nearly one-fifth were from nineteen to twenty-two years old, and of these about half were in the nineteen-year group.

At the present time, about a million boys and girls are wandering footloose all over the country. Since they are exposed to grave moral dangers, many will imperceptibly drift into criminal careers. But these young people may be regarded as a special problem, and our concern is not with them, but with young criminals whose environment and antecedents are similar to those of the four murderers in New York.

These young men were not tramps. Every one of them had a place which he called his home. But was it a home? We approach the heart of the matter. Of the four, only one came from a home unbroken by domestic dissension, untouched by crime or destitution. The others did not come from homes, but from nurseries of moral disorder.

This solution is familiar to all case workers. But there is not much help in it. It simply pushes the solution back another notch, and asks us to explain the abiding presence of these nurseries of moral disorder in our supposedly civilized communities. As long as they exist, the so-called preventive methods are almost as impotent as

methods of punishment and rehabilitation after the harm has been done.

Viewed in this light, the problem of the criminal youth is seen to depend upon that older problem of good government at which we now fumble, as though it were insoluble. It is not the work of the Government to go into broken homes to punish or to re-build, but, rather, so to provide for the common welfare that homes of this kind will be rare. A certain amount of comfort, as St. Thomas has written, is necessary for the practice of virtue; hence it is the fundamental duty of every Government to aid every citizen in the attainment of his last end by providing for him that irreducible minimum of comfort. We, the unco' good, who find that a trifling headache comes between us and our devotions, should be able to understand how easily a man whose belly cleaves to his backbone by reason of hunger, is readily tempted to crimes against property and the person. How can they who lead lives racked by hunger and by apprehension for the future, maintain a nursery of virtue in the destitute hovels that their growing children call home?

Youthful crime is only a symptom of a deeper, graver evil. We do well to fight it by building schools, maintaining juvenile courts and probation bureaus, and by establishing other means of prevention. But youthful crime will not greatly decrease until the State acknowledges its duties, asserts its rightful authority, and girds itself to the task of stabilizing those social conditions under which every man can secure that share of the commodities of this world which is necessary, as St. Thomas writes, "for virtuous action."

The Senator and the Soviets

IN an article published by the Hearst syndicated newspapers, Senator Borah, of Idaho, advocates the formal recognition by the United States of the Soviet Government. Senator Borah is probably correct when he contends that there can be "no economic health or stability" in Europe or in the world, until the Russian problem is settled, and that it cannot be settled as long as Russia is treated as an outlaw among the nations. But it does not follow that the settlement, using the word in its truest sense, of this problem will be achieved through recognition by the United States. It is more probable that the resumption of diplomatic relations would merely strengthen the Government in its present purposes. And those purposes are not compatible with civilization, as civilization has been understood since the birth of the Babe of Bethlehem.

On the Senator's own showing, the Soviets deliberately attack "three great and imperishable instincts of the human race—religion, the family, and property." Senator Borah believes that this policy of extermination will "no doubt, be changed," although he is forced to admit that he cannot discern any movement which might justify an expectation of "a speedy change." As a matter of fact, there is hardly a country in Europe which cannot justly complain of the machinations of Soviet agents, many of whom do not hesitate to violate as they

see fit the pledge which they have given not to interfere in domestic politics. The facts show, then, that the Soviets have abandoned no hateful policy either at home or abroad, and they have no intention of abandoning even one. On the other hand, since recognition by the United States and other countries will not only be interpreted as approval, but will also greatly strengthen the propaganda of which we and other Governments complain, it would be folly for the United States to change the present diplomatic status.

Senator Borah's contention that we have nothing to fear from Communistic propaganda is not impressive. His apparent belief that Soviet agents footloose in this country would do no harm, is decidedly dangerous. We have troubles enough at home at this time, and they are so heavy that we cannot afford to add to them.

The Garner Amendment

IT is all but amusing to note the obedience of some of our Elder Statesmen to the voice of the people. The amusement would be tempered by what the ascetics call "edification," did we not know that the zeal of some of them to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment is merely zeal to save their political careers. Now that the people have spoken, they say, we must put an end to Federal Prohibition, even if that act means a prolongation of our self-sacrificing labors for them.

To draw up an Amendment repealing the Eighteenth Amendment should not be a task of great difficulty. In fact the work has already been done by Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, who proposed last June the simple formula, "The Eighteenth Amendment is hereby repealed." These six words are the substance of the Amendment which has been proposed by Speaker Garner, and form its first clause. The second clause provides, in addition to the Constitutional requirements, that the Amendment shall be inoperative unless ratified by conventions in the States within seven years from the date of its submission.

It is to be hoped that the judiciary committee, to which the Amendment has been referred, will find no additions necessary. As it stands, the first clause of the Amendment simply restores the status which existed before 1920, when the control of the local liquor trade was vested exclusively in the police powers of the several States. It does not interfere with the right of the Federal Government to regulate the shipping of liquor in inter-State commerce. States preferring to remain dry will be protected in this preference by the old Webb-Kenyon statute, with the Reed amendment. States which prefer to legalize the liquor trade will take such action, without interference on part of the Federal Government. The proposed Amendment completely destroys Federal authority in the traffic within the States, which was the feature most productive of lawlessness and crime under the abominable Eighteenth Amendment.

In our judgment, any attempt to add to the Garner Amendment would be fatal. Whether or not the saloon shall return is entirely a matter of local concern, to be

arranged as the respective States and communities deem best. Hence we hope that Senator Glass will withdraw his Amendment which, in an obscure and labored fashion proposes to vest the Federal Government with power to conserve the gains of Prohibition by prohibiting "the return of the saloon."

Surely, unless the States have lost all ability to govern themselves, it may be left to them to determine whether the citizen shall drink his beer or his wine, sitting or standing at the place of sale, or be required to purchase his beverage in a bottle which he may not open before he has gained the privacy of his house. The Constitution is a statement of the fundamental rights and duties essential to all good government, whatever its particular form. It is not a code of legislation, and still less of petty sumptuary legislation, to be enforced against the needs and wishes of thousands of communities, by all the power of the Federal Government.

The regulation of the details which affect the liquor traffic properly fall within the rights and duties of the States. To the States that regulation should be reserved. The bitter experience of twelve years has taught us nothing, if it has not amply demonstrated that the Federal Government simply promotes lawlessness and disorder as often as it attempts to regulate what is in essence a matter for local supervision and control.

"Al" Smith

LATE in the afternoon of November 29, one Alfred E. Smith, of New York, made his way to the Town Hall, where he had been engaged by the managers of a charitable enterprise to sing "The Sidewalks of New York." Now Mr. Smith had often spoken in behalf of charitable enterprises, but never had he lifted up his voice in song for them. Hence the entire city awaited the experiment with interest, and the Hall was crowded.

Mr. Smith's voice is a credit to his years of training in the Fulton fish market and on the rostrum, but while his attack is vigorous, his tempo leaves something to be desired. His offering was greeted, however, with the applause usually reserved for such popular favorites as Madame Jeritza and John McCormack; and after a hurried consultation with the leader of the orchestra, Mr. Smith volunteered an encore. Throwing his head back and, of course, opening his mouth (for he is no crooner) Mr. Smith burst into the opening bars of that touching little ballad, so dear to our fathers, "O, the Bowery, the Bowery!" As the music sobbed into silence, there was hardly a wet eye in the house.

We do not know why we are telling the country about it, except that there is not a public man in the United States who could "put on" fifteen minutes of vaudeville, without losing a particle of his dignity, but, rather, enhancing it; and go off the stage leaving you with a choke in your throat, and a feeling that you had listened to something very tender and sweet and noble. The essential humanity of the man warms us, and with new respect we salute "Al" Smith, singing in the Town Hall for charity.

A Plan for Articulate Laymen

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

THE week of November 20-27 may well be looked on in future years as the starting point of a new era in Catholic life in the United States. After years of waiting, and months of hesitation since Pope Pius XI issued his call to them in "Quadragesimo Anno," groups of college-bred laymen in four parts of the country got together in conference to consider the bearings of our social philosophy on our national life and economy, and took steps to translate that philosophy in terms of national planning.

The National Catholic Alumni Federation, which sponsored these conferences, is the natural, and indeed inevitable, instrument by which the Pope's ideas, which are merely the millennial Catholic tradition, will be brought to bear on our national problems. The future progress of the movement thus started will be watched with sympathetic anxiety.

At the same time, in New York, a League for Social Justice was launched over the signature of several laymen. Its requirements are simple. It is not a new society, it has no officers and no organization. It simply asks of its members a pledge to inform themselves of the Catholic doctrine on social justice, to live it in their religious, social, and business lives, and moreover, to hear Mass once a week besides Sunday, and to receive Communion once a month, and weekly if possible, for the intention that social justice, which is the Kingdom of God on earth, may be attained in the United States. It is just such a practical combination of the spiritual with the intellectual that may be counted on to supply the force that will bring the Alumni enterprise to a successful conclusion. The League has an office at 30 West Sixteenth Street, New York, from which information and pledge cards can be obtained.

Now, if Catholic college graduates are to undertake a common study of our economic system, ending with a comprehensive plan adaptable in detail for our American scene, where are they to begin?

Obviously, the first step is one of *criticism* of the present system. In this critical process, there is need of a *criterion* as a guide; and this will depend entirely on a correct understanding of our social philosophy. Thus, a Socialist, with his particular philosophy in mind, will consider certain aspects of the system to be wrong which we would retain, and the same would be true on other matters of the Individualist. For an example, we will demand some system of administering private property in production, against the Socialist, even though we may agree with him in his criticisms of how private property has been administered, while against the Individualist we will maintain the right of society to limit private property.

Then, this critical process completed, with both superficial and essential defects duly catalogued and appraised, a constructive *program* will need to be devised. Here the

dominating *idea* will have to be prepared and polished until it stands out like a light. This idea will have to be made so clear that every step in the building process will conform to it. As Judge Dore said at the Fordham Conference, it was an idea which brought on the present disaster and according to that idea a whole edifice arose which proved unstable precisely because in its last analysis that idea was anarchy, and unsuited to build any edifice that would last. The dominating idea for the new edifice must be one formed out of reality, not from a priori reasoning as the old one was; and that reality must be the human reality, not a materialistic one.

The important thing in this critical process is to keep two things distinct: the defects which are defects precisely because they do not conform to the dominating idea of the present system and those defects which are defects of the dominating idea itself. Again, it is necessary to keep in mind another distinction, namely, the elementary one between causes and effects. Thus unemployment and overproduction are effects derived from other causes deeply rooted, though they, too, result in other effects more on the surface.

Then, the system itself will have to be examined in each of its parts: first, the *idea* underlying it, which is that of laissez-faire, of unlimited and unplanned competition, and secondly, the *elements* of the system, which are: capital, labor, their partnership, production, distribution, the consumer, and the State. The *defects* of each of these will have to be examined in turn, so that we can see clearly which are superficial and which are fundamental, which are causes and which are effects. This is important, because when we are building up a new system, we shall have to take care lest we are offering merely palliatives instead of a stable remedy.

In the *idea* governing the present system, I offer three fundamental *errors*, with acknowledgments to Thomas F. Woodlock:

1. The *moral* error: selfishness and greed; that is, the operation of the economic process with a view to individual or group profit *alone*, and not with a view to the total social good also;

2. The *economic* error: unlimited competition, under the fallacious guise of unlimited opportunity for all, which turned out to be the ideal system under which individual greed can operate;

3. The *political* error: unrestrained nationalism, which is merely the moral error of selfishness in the political order, so that nations operate for their own good *alone*, without regard to the international welfare.

The *elements* of the economic system operating along these false ideas will be found to contain, among others, these *fundamental defects*:

1. *Profits* constantly tend to gravitate into a few hands and to be saved; that is, to be re-invested into new pro-

ducing capital; and this capital, under the system, results in a producing capacity which grows faster than its correlative, consuming capacity, does. This results in a constantly widening gap between them, until they can no longer be bridged. Profits then stop, and production with them, until consuming capacity catches up with produced goods, when the wheels theoretically will start again. The idea of *laissez-faire* contemplates these cycles, but considers that the adjustment will be automatic. This time, however, the automatic adjustment did not take place, which is probably a sign that consuming and producing capacities got too far apart.

2. *Labor*, under the system, cannot be done full justice in producing industry if there is to be any profit in it. The *laissez-faire* idea also contemplates this fact, and Sir Arthur Salter, in "Recovery," lists as one of the causes of the downfall of *laissez-faire* the meddling with its automatic working by necessary labor-reform laws.

3. The *partnership* of labor and capital, resulting in industry, in "good times" yields a surplus which ethically belongs to both members of the team after wages for capital and labor have been paid. In "bad times" this surplus is arbitrarily used as wages for capital, and labor is laid off without wages, thus further reducing the buying power of the vast mass of the people at a time when it is most needed to consume the surplus of goods.

4. *Mass production* is incompatible with the *laissez-faire* system, which does not contemplate the correlative, mass consumption. Attempts were made before 1929 to make it fit in, by the expedients of advertising and instalment buying, that is, by creating wants and needs and extending credit to the buyer, both of which had defined limits, while mass production had no visible limits. The financial structure superimposed on mass production, on the other hand, was such that it had to have indefinite extension or collapse. Mass production is workable only in a system in which production capacity is rigidly controlled with a view to consumption.

5. *Distribution*, theoretically, should be almost unlimited. There is no reason why the hundreds of millions in Asia, Africa, and South America should not live at as high a standard of living as we here in the United States. There is no such thing as overproduction of goods here as long as those peoples are unsupplied with goods. Now they are starving in the midst of plenty. The fact that our system ruins itself when it produces to the very height of its capacity, that the farmers are impoverished by bumper crops, that scarcity is the normal cause of profit, is an essential indictment of the system.

6. The *consumer*, who is by definition the key point of the whole system, has not been considered at all; at least, he has been considered hopefully and vaguely as a consumer, but not as a *buyer*. Production has not been built up with any regard to whether the added product can and will be bought; production in each industry vies against itself, and each industry vies against the others, with no regard to the consideration of whether the whole load of consumption can be carried by the public. And

since industry was carried on largely by borrowed money, and since these debts envisaged an inflated production, then, when consumption is deflated, the debts remain a crushing and impossible burden.

7. The *State*, as Pope Pius has pointed out, has allowed itself to be cluttered up with all sorts of irrelevant and useless functions. The Pope turns our attention to the true function of the State, which is not merely the enforcement of public order and the sacredness of contracts, on the one hand, nor the control of purely private and local affairs, on the other, but the reasoned and lofty direction of the social organism for social ends.

It is on those seven points, also, that the new edifice will be erected. It will revolve around these *principles*:

1. Social justice means that capitalization, production, and distribution proceed and grow only if the socially good or harmful effects are taken into consideration along with the individual profit to be made.

2. Profits must be restricted and savings curbed so that production will expand only in proportion as consuming capacity gradually grows throughout the world.

3. Long-term borrowing, it has been suggested, should end, and in its place should come some form of preferred equity ownership, gradual retirement, and management control, if necessary. Dana Skinner has proposed this.

4. Naturally all this means the replacement of our present anarchy in industry by a voluntary planned economy, to be reached in limited objectives, and in conformity with our Constitution.

Asthore

LEONARD FEENEY, S.J.

I AM, if I may be allowed to stress one of my qualities, a good companion for an old person. My early life, up to my eleventh year, was spent in constant association with an aged grandfather. In those years of our childhood (his second and my first), my grandfather and I took a sympathetic interest in each other's joys and miseries. He preferred me to any of his old cronies, and I him to any of my playmates. We were kindred spirits and loved each other dearly.

It was my business when his memory became unreliable to solve my grandfather's bewilderments concerning the time of day, the hour of dinner, and the whereabouts of his spectacles. I had not only exclusive access to his thoughts but also extraordinary privileges about his person. I was allowed to tie his boot laces, dust his hat, wind his watch, and light his pipe. And my youthful ear had a monopoly on his stories.

His stories were invariably about Ireland, and rigidly Irish in flavor; but there was universal stuff in them: ghosts, fairies, christenings, wakes, weddings, famines, battles. The battles were my favorites, fought, it seems, from the beginning of the world, against an army of ruffians called "low Briddish." The "low Briddish" kept coming across the sea in order to persecute our people, the "high Bernians." We were a peaceful and gentle race. They were unkind and cruel. They killed

our orators. They poisoned our potatoes. Many a summer's afternoon my grandfather and I sat on the front doorstep, with our chins in our hands, shaking our heads and hating the "low Briddish," wishing them bad luck, and calling them the names they deserved.

From my grandfather I acquired many of my personal characteristics: the habit, for instance, of licking back my hair with my hand when I am annoyed, or of putting my thumbs behind my suspenders when I am amused. From him, too, I derived my sole musical talent, the art of humming Irish tunes. My grandfather took pains to teach me these ancestral arias with great thoroughness; and though I never tried to put words to them (nor did he), I learned to manage them in melody behind a closed mouth with unmistakable authenticity and sweetness. Even to this day native-born Irishmen will testify that I am a splendid Celtic hummer, with an extraordinary nasal range, and a most interesting repertory of hums.

Every child in the course of his development makes at least one precocious remark. Some children, provided they be unusually bright or abnormally stupid, make many. But no child fails to make at least one. I made one, I am quite sure *only* one, but I think it was a very good one.

My grandfather and I were sitting—need I say?—on the front doorstep one drowsy afternoon in July. It was getting late. The sun was ready to go down. Our voices were weary and our emotions tired. Finn McCool, a large-jowled Irish chieftain, had just executed some fine stunts for us in the movies of our imaginations. At intervals we had cleared our soft palates and strummed a little music, keeping it in time with a metronome accompaniment of heel and toe. My grandfather had made a few meditative remarks on his favorite holy topic, the Blessed Mother of God, at the mention of whose name he invariably raised his hat, even though it occurred twice in a sentence. I, being hatless, was in the habit of paying my devoir to any spoken syllables indicating Our Lady's reality by making her a reverential flick of my hair. But, as I said, at last we grew tired, tired of talk and romantics. And we lapsed into one of those long silences we often had together when the conversation lagged.

My grandfather sighed. It was a long, deep sigh, indicating not the fatigue of a day but the fatigue of a whole life. He was growing very feeble at the time, only six months before his death. He sighed again, and looked at me for ten intense minutes that were full of flashes issuing from the core of his soul to the kernel of mine. "I am all through!" he said without speaking, "you must carry on. You must keep alive the thoughts, the dreams, the stories we once shared together."

I sighed back at my grandfather to show him that I understood his message, and was assuming my burden with pride and regret. And in some dim way I promised him with my eyes that if ever I had a grandson I would see to it that our stories were kept alive and that our tradition did not die. I did not know at that time that it

was God's holy design to make me the last of my line.

When this sacred trust had been executed and I had in silence received it, my grandfather shriveled, and for some moments after seemed to lose his individuality. His hands grew cold, his face expressionless, and his head dropped dismally on his breast. For a little while he stopped being anybody's grandfather, even mine, and became just an old hulk of a body with a spirit floating somewhere inside it, a soul unrelated to material dimensions and movements, without a function on any human purpose. I pulled his head down, and putting my mouth close to his ear, whispered, "Is it lonely in there, grandfather?" . . . I hope I am allowed to consider this a remarkable question, very precocious, and, indeed, deeply mystical.

My grandfather saw to a nicety the point of my strange query. He wiped his bad eye with the back of his hand—he had one bad eye which for the last ten years of his life was constantly inflamed, and which my mother had to bathe three times a day with boric acid and warm water—and answered, "It is, *asthore!*"

There is, in Irish, no expression of endearment so delicate in its nuance or so extravagant in its meaning as the term *asthore*. It is very probably the loveliest word in that language. It is elusive in its emotional significance and impossible to translate straightforwardly into English, much like the word *doux* in French. I once heard Hilaire Belloc struggling to render in good Anglo-Saxon the expression *le doux air d'Anjou*. "The sweet air of Anjou," he said, would never do. Nor would "the gentle air of Anjou." But possibly "the quiet kindness of the Angevin air" would, in roundabout fashion, indicate the spirit of the word. "Asthore" is even more difficult.

The best way to convey the meaning of "asthore" is to state the relationship which must exist in persons between whom its employment is warranted. "Asthore" supposes in general what I may call "an affectionate, protective superiority" on the part of the one using it toward the one to whom it is used. A young person never calls another young person "asthore"; nor would a child use it to an elder, nor elder people among themselves. There are three situations in which the word achieves its power and its point, which usages I may designate as (1) The Lover-Beloved; (2) The Parent-Child; and (3) The Grandparent-Grandchild.

(1) The L-B use of "asthore" is always dead serious. It is, in this case, never a mere pet word, nor one to be employed in any light flirtation. For instance, an Irish lad would never think of saying to a pretty girl at a cross-roads dance "You have nice eyes, asthore," or "What are you doing next Tuesday evening, asthore?" This would be an utter profanation of the word. It would be in impossible bad taste, much as though a young American "fresh guy" should say to an indefinite blonde waitress in a cafe "Hello, bright eyes! I can see right on the spot that God meant you from all eternity to be my comfort, my joy, and my delight. Would you mind telling me your name and letting me take you to the movies?"

No. When a young man calls his sweetheart "asthore" it is required (a) that she be not merely his sweetheart, but his "sweet soul"; and (b) that they be realizing for the moment some phase of the spiritual quality of love, its sacrificial character, its burden, its rapture, and its mystery. "And will you love me when I am a weeshy, scrawny, wither-may-jingle old woman?" says she. If she has asked it smilingly, he will answer: "Yes, acushla (or mavourneen or machree)" meaning "Yes, my darling, or my honey, or my sweet one." But if she asked this question *with tears in her eyes*, his answer is "I will, asthore!" That's the way the word goes among lovers.

(2) The Parent-Child use of "asthore" is playful. It is the term of affection by which fathers and mothers (or their equivalents: aunts or uncles, or very close neighbors) indicate to youngsters what adorable annoyances they are, what agreeable nuisances. When a father calls his little son "asthore" he means: "I love you because you are my little son. I love you because you are at once such a joy to me, and such a bother. I wouldn't swap you for ten million pounds. And I wouldn't give tuppence for ten more like you!" This is the second meaning of "asthore."

(3) The Grandparent-Grandchild use of "asthore" is the most sacred of all. It is a word of ritual, the love cry of a tribe, the call of the blood overleaping a generation. It is the means by which an aged human heart asks its own posterity, not for affection but for existence, not for companionship but for continuation. It makes vocable an act, not of love alone, but of love and faith fused into one virtue, which we call "hope," and which we rightly set highest of all the operations of the human spirit in its present condition of probation and exile. If King David had written his psalms in Irish he would have called his Royal Grandchild "asthore."

The night my grandfather died, just before the death rattle began in his throat, he raised a blessed candle and waved good-by to all his neighbors and kindred, to the whole world and all its countries and peoples. And then with the last bit of strength left in him he whispered "Good-by, asthore" to me. Shortly afterward the undertaker arrived to dress his lifeless body in its coffin clothes, surround it with candles, and give it a parlor respectability. I have never had a grandfather since that time. . . .

Freudians, psychoanalysts, and chemical philosophers who are anxious to dissect and desecrate all forms of honorable human affection will be interested in this personal confession. It may give rise to a whole new department in the field of behavioristic studies hitherto left untouched: "the little-boy-old-man neurosis"; or maybe "the atavistic perversion"; or more likely "the Abraham complex." And if their textbooks can prove that the implications of my psychic irregularity are sufficiently degenerate and gloomy to arouse popular interest, science will hand over a fresh inspiration to literature. A new form of melancholy will develop among our novelists. America's leading dramatist will put me in a play.

"He Stopped Thinking"

EDMUND BOOTH YOUNG

WHEN it happens, as now and then it does, that a person with some intelligence withdraws from a religious fellowship which puts "clear thinking" and "open-mindedness" in its show window, and submits to the Catholic Church, as I have done, for instance, it is said with a show of tolerance and by way of explanation that "he has stopped thinking." It is assumed, of course, that if he had not grown weary while in the way of liberalism or his mental engine, so to speak, had not accumulated carbon, he would have continued satisfied with ever seeking. The "clear thinking" of those who proclaim it most is that sort of reasoning which thinks the old away; it thinks away the Divinity and authority of Christ; it dispels the dogmatic fogs of the historic Church; it destroys all spiritual assurances; and, continuing to "think austere," ends in the attainment of nothing. Its triumph song is "We do not know."

Open-mindedness, in the liberal sense, is that mental quality which welcomes provisionally a new idea today and gives it up tomorrow. *Ave et vale!* It belongs to a mind open at both ends with nothing theologically or morally certain finding lodgment within. There is a flow of ideas, but no salvage. Liberalism scorns being too sure, and the attainment of a soul to a spiritually grateful idea is regarded as a sign of a closed mind. Still more, any distress felt and manifested when a cherished belief or hope is assailed is evidence of an unwillingness to progress. The writer once listened to a well-known Brooklyn preacher whose words made him (the listener) unconsciously betray a slight degree of emotion. The speaker remarked to him afterward that redness behind the ears was a very bad sign—of what, I fail exactly to remember, but I think it was of a "closed mind." Yet, no doubt, the open-minded preacher himself would redden behind the ears if some one of his loyalties, outside of religion (of course), were brought into question.

The habit of the liberal is, generally speaking, to read the popularized physical science, the religious criticism, and the biological psychology of today, and to reject as outworn whatever of the older thought happens to be attacked (and just because it is attacked) by the more advanced and daring writers. To be old fashioned is to be stupid, and stupidity does not become a religious liberal and is derogatory to the "Divinity of Man." The great phrase is "creative thought," even though, alas, there has not appeared any new and striking creation really adequate to the spiritual needs of man.

Conferences are an important part of the technique of organized liberalism, and yet, how little that is religiously constructive and positive has come to light! After a century and more of liberalism, what have we? Humanism; God rethought out of the picture; the soul remade into nerves; the future life dismissed as a pious myth! Of course, all liberals have not attained the Humanist position, but they have not thought austere enough. The intellectual get-together, however, affords opportunity for

self-expression and the airing of opinions, and perhaps (who knows) talk may be an end in itself. Liberalism, like all the forms of Protestantism, is prone to talk. Is anything to be celebrated? Let us talk! No longer *Oremus*, but *Dicamus*.

Not that I would decry real thinking and have it said "he stopped thinking," but one would expect large generators to produce more current, or, to change the figure, more and finer gold to appear when the crucible has been made so very, very hot.

Yes, to leave the ranks of the liberals is to invite the criticism that one has perceptibly aged and has stopped thinking, especially when one enters the Catholic Church.

To the writer, it does not seem that acceptance of the Faith and obedience of the historic Catholic Church necessitates the closing of his mind, the giving up of the search for truth, and a lapse into spiritual and mental inertia. Perhaps I have not been a Catholic long enough to appreciate the intellectual perils awaiting me!

Where Catholic truth is concerned, the Catholic's mind is, of course, closed, because there is sufficient reason why it should be. This Catholic truth—the deposit of Faith—lies in a realm beyond that of experimentation or discovery, yet it follows upon antecedent reasoning which establishes the truth that God is, has revealed Himself, and in the Person of Christ has established His Church. Without the revelation of Christ and the witness of His Church, this truth would not have been known. In not being "scientific," it cannot be ruled out by physical science and cannot be denied by anyone except upon grounds really prejudiced. The denier may stress the fallibility of the Founder of Christianity and his self-deception and the false notion that He did not found a Church, but here is where some really good thinking may be done. And such good thinking has been done century after century by those very Catholics who are supposed not to think. It seems to me that I have heard of certain Church Fathers in the East and in the West, of Thomas Aquinas and others, notably among the idle monks, who employed their minds to their and our advantage. Today Catholic apologists and Catholic journalists would seem not, in their intellectual reach and power and productiveness, to be second to those whose intensity and purity of thought are written large upon their brow.

In the world of philosophy, the work of the late Cardinal Mercier was negligible neither in quantity nor quality. Was his mind a closed one? Was he afraid to think creatively? That he was a neo-Scholastic was due, hardly to the coercing of his thought by authority, but rather to the fact that he was really free. And when the mind is free—not clouded by a misconception of its freedom—it must follow along, because of its nature, to the end the eminent Cardinal reached. This may be disputed, but I think it is true—and in thinking so, what do I prove but that I have not "stopped thinking"?

In Catholic thought there is high regard for logic—the science of right thinking—and, if it be not raising an impertinent question, in the curricula of how many non-Catholic schools and colleges does logic have a necessary

place? It would seem that the modern mind—the "fine mind"—has no need of it, if there is not a dread, indeed, that it may interfere with one's perfect liberty and somehow clog the open mind.

Up to the present, I have only hinted at my belief that Catholics do think even though they cling to logic, and, what is more, hold a "Faith once delivered to the Saints," but I should now indicate a little more clearly why, having become a Catholic, I do not experience alarm over the suggested possibility of an untimely intellectual death. The thought of such a horror is at this initial stage inhibited by a lively appreciation of a newly won delivery from futility—the futility of philosophical systems which, because of different methods and conclusions, are hopelessly irreconcilable. One system is as good or as bad as another; yet one must have a philosophy unless one is willing to exist in a state of coma. Then there is the futility of religious systems with a spiritual content scarcely more definite than that it is good to strive onward and upward forever. (It used to be said when creeds were held, "Whatever our creed, we are all striving for the same place," but now, thanks to Harry Elmer Barnes and others, the "same place," viewed as a "beyond," is ruled out, for liberal Protestants, by astronomical physics.) One is delivered, too, from the futility of a quasi-moral order underlying which there is no authority save the unstable sanction of custom.

An escape from futility has its immediate reward, but why is there assurance that the escape is into a place of real mental satisfaction where one can think things out and reach for himself some very definite and stable conclusions?

The Catholic, as no other religionist, appreciates and follows reason. Where others, uncertain of man's reasoning power, base religion upon intuition, emotion, or a regard for "values," the Catholic applies his mind to the material world and life and, taking things in a common-sense way and as he finds them, begins to reason. He regards his world as real as himself. He accepts the judgment of unsophisticated man. His world is no mere illusion. The senses of man, being a necessary part of himself, he trusts; his deductions based upon information received through these senses he trusts, because inferring is congruous with his nature.

He argues that this world is contingent upon a Power competent to have made it. The world, having intelligence within it and showing (to him who will understand) evidences of intelligent direction, must be contingent upon a Personality. The Catholic is free from the misconception of personality which would make a body essential to it. The Thinker back of creation would not be a Thinker if he were not self-conscious, and being self-conscious he is a Person. From effect the Catholic thinks to Cause, and from intelligence found in the effect to the intelligence of the First Cause. An "Impersonal energy" really explains nothing; a God impersonal, would be hardly more than a philosophical convenience, and not very satisfactory at that.

Then from God to man's moral responsibility—to the

reasonableness of a self-revelation of God—to a just appraisal of the Person and work of Christ—to the weighing of the Gospel Message—so the Catholic reasons and finds satisfaction for his mind and support for his soul

in the Church which has in all ages been the commodious home, loved by those whose mental competency has not been inferior to the "open-minded" and "creative thinkers" of today.

Hard-Headed Holiness

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, S.J.

THE opening words of the opening Mass of Advent were a challenge, nay, rather an invitation from our Mother the Church:

"To Thee, O Lord, have I lifted up my soul; in Thee O Lord I put my trust. . . . Show me, O Lord, Thy ways, and teach me Thy paths."

She wants us to say those words truthfully, of course; and if we say them truthfully, we are either actually holy or actually striving for holiness.

But just there, from practical dealing with souls, seems to come the rub. So many persons have a wrong idea of what fundamental, rock-bottom holiness is. It frequently happens that the moment a person thinks of "being holy," he or she envisages, as quite essential, long prayers, much mortification, heroic labors directly and exclusively in God's service, and much else that is extraordinary. Or else they bethink themselves of special novenas, and vigil lights, and other good, but non-essential, devotions.

Definite impetus to such thinking has been given by the way the lives of saints and holy folk have frequently been written. Whatever was "front-page stuff" in their lives was given prominence—and the rest was told at best in passing. Now we all like to be "on the front page," and so an almost insidious appeal is made to that right-under-the-surface trait in all of us—the dramatic. Father "Willy" Doyle made 100,000 aspirations a day—and so the neophyte starts in with a comptometer. St. Aloysius lived on an egg a day, and so the latest would-be saint buys a scale with which to measure his approximation to holiness. These are not imaginary cases. They are cases of actual twentieth-century living aspirants to sanctity.

But they mistook the unusual for the essential. They mistook the outcroppings, the end-effects, for the internal reality. If one is masterfully holy, one will pray much, very much, and may fast much (if one can do so and do one's work), and practise great mortification, external and especially internal. But that is masterful, unusual, outstanding holiness. For such a one we have come to reserve the name *saint*.

But essential holiness—what is it? We all like formulae and slogans, and so it may help to summarize holiness thus:

I am holy, when I do
What I ought to do
When I ought to do it
How I ought to do it, and
Why.

In fact, this is so fundamental, so rock bottom, that if it be absent, all other efforts may easily be delusional.

It is a simple formula, but comprehensive. Let us see.

I have my work to do in life—whatever it may be. To do this work I must rise at a definite hour; I must eat; I must perform allotted tasks; I must have a certain amount of recreation; and I must keep my soul free from sin, and united to God by prayer. Whether I be child or adult, man or woman, rich or poor, healthy or sickly, there is a round of daily tasks, from my morning prayers across high noon right up to my final "good night" to God, each in its turn demanding my attention.

Hard-headed holiness consists, and consists essentially, in doing *what* I ought to do, and *when*, and *how*. Too many overlook this and start in pursuit of the unusual, the extraordinary, or even bizarre—yes, bizarre, for such there has been in the lives of some saints. In fact, one must always remember that at times a saint can be more admirable than imitable. A penitent once said to me when I remonstrated with him about excessive fasting: "Why can't I fast that much? Men have become saints by fasting." The answer was: "Yes, *they* have; but *you* will become a 'nut'." In fact, at that time he was headed straight for a bad nervous breakdown from insufficient nutrition.

Not that hard-headed holiness will not include mortification and self-denial. Of course it will. The mere doing "what, and when, and how, and why," will entail a great deal of self-denial, and self-control, and a large banishment of selfishness. Just try it! To tackle every job as it swings around, and to be on time for every job, and to do each job of life well—that requires much self-control.

Again, mortification is required from all, because it is only by denying ourselves lawful pleasures that we ever gain sufficient mastery over ourselves to stand firm against sinful allurements. To attain sheer manhood and womanhood and to attain fundamental holiness small penances are inexorably required. But they can be carried by all, without danger to life or mind.

Once we have grasped the wide implications of this simple formula, holiness, real holiness, is simple, too. Most of us have no doubt that doing the hard things of life, and saying our prayers, etc., will make us holy. But I should be convinced that:

I can be a saint on the dance floor, just as I can be a saint in the church;

I can be a saint at the beach, just as I can be a saint on my knees praying;

I can be a saint reading a novel, just as I can be a saint reading the Bible;

I can be a saint in the theater or at the movie, just as I can be a saint in the solitude of my room.

If I am not a saint at these times, then the only reason is—either I have a false notion of holiness; or the dance, or the novel, or the show, etc., is bad, and unfit for me. The lawful pleasures of life, precisely because they are lawful, may be and should be taken holily. I can be a saint eating ice cream just as I can be a saint keeping a black fast.

Unquestionably, the pleasant things of life are hardest to handle holily. Their very pleasantness is quite apt to draw me on too far and to entice me to use them beyond what I should. And so I must keep my heart close to God by prayer. Long hours of prayer are not always necessary, but most necessary is the amount of prayer required by my state of life and the immediate environment (more or less dangerous) in which I find myself. Certainly, no matter who I am or where I am, I should pray: in the morning, and again in the evening (that were mere politeness to God); at Mass on Sundays; when I receive the Sacraments; and on and off during the day when I feel the need of God's help. One of the real duties of life is prayer; and so, as in every other duty of life, and more especially than in any other duty, I must pray when and how I ought.

And this leads us to the fourth member of the slogan—*why*. All that I do, I must ultimately do for God, i.e., because He wants me to do it for Him. I can dance for God, and I can swim for God, and I can see movies for God, and I can work for God. Long ago St. Paul said to the Corinthians: "Therefore, whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God." And again to the Colossians: "All whatsoever you do in word or in work, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." And St. Paul, remember, was writing to the "man-in-the-street" of Colossae, and of Corinth, one of the wickedest towns of the ancient world. Thus, hearkening to him, whether I am on my knees or on the tennis court, in church or in the banquet hall, at work or at play, asleep or awake—it is all for God.

Real holiness, then, is a simple thing. Real holiness is part of the warp and woof of our daily lives, and is so essentially. And really, did we not learn this in our penny catechism? There we were told that "sanctifying grace makes the soul holy and pleasing to God." Certainly, if we are living up to the essential duties of our lives we are free from mortal sin and thus have sanctifying grace—and so are holy; yes, holy with no mean holiness, for if we die with sanctifying grace, Heaven is ultimately ours.

Beyond this rock-bottom holiness there are, of course, all the reaches of highest sanctity. This larger sanctity is obligatory on some to whom God has graciously given His higher call. But even then the foundation of the highest edifice is laid by doing "what and when and how and why."

In a hard-headed way, then, we may and should pray as the Church would have us. And when God has shown

us His ways and taught us His paths along the lines where the duties of life call, He will always show us the higher paths whither His love beckons us and where the great heroes and heroines of God have walked, masterful in their love of Him alone.

Education

The Retarded Child

M. E. DUPAUL, M.A.

THE handicapped child recalls to one's mind the blind, the deaf, the feeble minded, the crippled, and the delinquent. Formerly these unfortunates were committed to State and private institutions, since treatment and training were not considered a responsibility of the schools. The others, less unfortunate, the partially seeing, the hard of hearing, the defective in speech, the emotionally unstable, the less-seriously mentally and physically retarded, and those of lowered vitality, were admitted to the schools and their failures in regular school work were regarded as unavoidable. Prevention did not enter into the treatment. Remedial treatment, home instruction, vocational guidance, were not assumed as school responsibilities. Today the school recognizes its responsibility for these handicapped children.

The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection reports that 3,000,000 children in the United States require special training to enable them to make the most of their possibilities. Of this huge number of handicapped, two per cent, or 450,000 pupils, are mentally retarded to such a degree that they require special education if they are to meet their responsibility. However, less than fourteen per cent of these are actually enrolled in special classes to fit them to make the most of their possibilities, which, if neglected, terminate in misery, dependency, inefficiency, and crime.

The financial cost of retardation is enormous. The Federal Bureau of Education reports that ten per cent of school budgets is spent reteaching children what they have been taught, but failed to learn. And while we are apt to think that the financial burden is great, the development of anti-social habits and attitudes is apt to be still more of a burden. The by-products of retardation manifest themselves in bad behavior, distorted personality, truancy, and juvenile delinquency.

From the report of the New York Crime Commission, we learn that adult criminals are largely recruited from truants and juvenile delinquents. From this it is obvious that the products of school retardation cannot be measured in dollars and cents, but rather in human wreckage.

The first reported study of retardation was undertaken in 1907 under the auspices of the Russell Sage Foundation, the work being done by Leonard Ayres and Luther Gulick. A year later, when the report of their findings was made public, educators and those interested in this problem were amazed at the seriousness of the problem. One finds the contributing factors to retardation in the child himself—his mental, emotional, and physical make-

up, in the home environment, the community, and the school with its complicated organization and administration, as well as the teacher. If retardation is to be combated, all of these factors must be carefully studied, and in many cases the present attitude and condition changed.

Mental retardation registers in cases of feeble-mindedness, low-normal I. Q., and special disabilities in certain subjects, usually number concepts or reading power. The backward child does not necessarily imply the borderline defective, the feeble minded, and the dull, but all those who are backward as a result of causes other than intellectual inferiority. Here one finds the slow or dull normal children whose retardation is not sufficient to require special class instruction. These children fill the gap between low-average normality and inferior normality.

Even though mental tests might record accurately the child's mental ability it does not rate his emotional quotient. On the emotional side we find the bashful, the antagonistic, the dreamer, the shut-in type, those who suffer grievances, real or imaginary, and the adolescent with his conflicts. These symptoms, while they might not seem serious, if they become aggravated, end in permanent pathological conditions.

Other personality or emotional causes result from school or class situations. One of the best ways to increase the mental health of children is to begin with parents and teachers. Regarding physical disabilities and defects, it is generally conceded now that mind and body are so closely related that the functioning of one cannot be separated from the other. Many children credited with being stupid are in reality sick. Only in rare cases can child or adult do his best mental work in the face of such physical handicaps as defective vision and hearing, defective teeth, malnutrition, hypertrophied tonsils, adenoids, speech defects, glandular disturbances, and nervous diseases.

If children can be free from physical defects and handicaps, and provided with adequate food, rest, and wholesome surroundings, they should be able to measure up to their maximum efficiency. Children below a reasonable standard of good health usually show a moderate amount of retardation. Repeated acute illnesses are responsible for considerable retardation in school work, not only because of illnesses themselves, but because of frequent absences from school which these illnesses entail. Absences from school from illness are three times the number from all other causes combined. In one school, 600 days per 1,000 per school year were lost for colds alone. (Hagerstown, Md., study.) A study in Cincinnati revealed that respiratory illnesses were responsible for four-fifths of the illnesses. In this study the absences of children who failed to be promoted were twenty-five days as compared with the average of five days on the part of children who passed.

Physical defects other than actual infection act in much the same manner. Children who have to repeat a grade are also children who have a large percentage of physical defects. Studies show that physical defects are three times as common in children who fail as among those

who passed. While the child himself is regarded as the primary factor in retardation, such undermining factors as the broken or disturbed home with its poverty and emotional stress are bound to produce in the child unhappiness, worry, mental distractions, and loss of interest. Added to these are child labor, lack of cooperation, antagonism, frequent removal, and language difficulties. Unwholesome distractions in the community are conducive to absences from school or loss of school interest, resulting in retardation.

The case, as here briefly sketched, has long been familiar to the teacher, especially in our larger cities. Familiar as it is, it has never ceased to distress the earnest teacher. What can the school do to help these children? Some suggestions will be offered in a concluding paper.

Sociology

Lawless Law in the Mooney Case

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

WHEN the Senate declined to act, a private firm, the Gotham House, Inc., of New York, undertook to publish the Mooney-Billings report. As presented for the use of the Wickersham Commission, the title of this report ran, "Draft of the Mooney-Billings Report, submitted to the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement by the Section on Lawless Enforcement of Law." The authors of the report are Dr. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School, Carl Stern, and Walter Pollak, and the chairman of the Section was the Hon. W. S. Kenyon, formerly Senator from Iowa, and now on the Federal bench.

The decision of Mr. Justice Sutherland in the Scottsboro case attaches to the conduct of the officials who arrested Mooney, and of the prosecutors who brought him to trial, a new interest and, I venture to think, pointed legal significance. The nub of the Scottsboro decision was that

During perhaps the most critical period of the proceedings against these defendants, that is to say from the time of their arraignment until the beginning of their trial, when consultation, thorough-going investigation and preparation were vitally important, the defendants did not have the aid of counsel in any real sense, although they were as much entitled to such aid during that period as at the trial itself.

According to the record, Mooney and his wife were arrested, without the formality of a warrant, on July 27, 1916, thrown into jail, and kept there incommunicado. Mooney was not allowed to leave his cell, even for exercise; Mrs. Mooney was locked in a bathroom for two days and nights, where she was compelled to sleep on a pallet on the floor between the tubs. No charge was placed against them until August 1, the fifth day after their arrest, when the Grand Jury returned indictments against them for murder.

Now Section 825 of the Penal Code of California provides that on his arrest, "the defendant must in all cases be taken before the magistrate without unnecessary delay." The officials disregarded this provision, not inadvertently

but deliberately. When the police captain was cross-examined by the late Bourke Corkran, that fact was clearly elicited.

Q. You knew that a man arrested without a warrant you were at once to take before the nearest magistrate?

A. Yes, I am familiar with that section of the Code.

Q. Then why didn't you do it?

A. In the interest of justice.

Q. In the interest of justice you suspended law?

A. Yes, sir.

The colloquy also explains why the Mooney case was investigated by the Section on the Lawless Enforcement of Law.

Thus it appears that the defendants, Mooney and his wife, were illegally arrested. But the illegality did not stop there. Section 825 also provides that after arrest, "any attorney at law entitled to practise in the courts of record of California, may at the request of the prisoner or any relative of such prisoner, visit the person so arrested." The officials set this provision at naught by holding Mooney incommunicado from counsel for eleven days, which is worse than the Scottsboro scandal, denounced by Mr. Justice Sutherland. In the meantime, Mooney's lodgings had been searched, and various exhibits seized, in blithe disregard of Article I, section 19, of the Constitution of the State of California. Brought before the Grand Jury, Mooney protested that he had not been permitted to avail himself of counsel. The usual badgering by the prosecutor followed, and at one stage was resented, apparently, by a member of the Grand Jury.

A Grand Juror: The gentleman has not refused to testify. He said he wanted counsel first.

District Attorney: It is a question for him to determine, not his counsel.

The Grand Juror: The fact of him not having had counsel kind of puts a different light on it, doesn't it?

But the district attorney ended the matter by saying, "It's entirely up to you. We can't arrange for lawyers, and *all that kind of stuff*," that "kind of stuff" being the processes imposed under penalty by statute, and by the Constitution, not to speak of the elementary demands of common justice. The upshot of the matter was that Mooney was not allowed counsel until August 7, eleven days after his arrest, and six days after his indictment on a capital charge.

Untrained in the technicalities of law, I cannot urge that the decision in the Scottsboro case makes possible a review of Mooney's case by the Federal courts. I merely give the opinion for what it may be worth, and observe that smaller cause was alleged for the Scottsboro Negroes than can be alleged for Mooney.

A personal remark may be in place at this point. I have never discussed the preliminaries in the Mooney case without, sooner or later, having an objection thrown in my face. "What! You don't mean to say that Mooney is innocent? Why look at the man's record!" I am not in the least interested in the man's record; let us concede it to be bad. Nor does the question of the man's guilt or innocence seem to me to be at all pertinent to the issue. My sole interest is in the guilt or innocence

of Mooney's prosecutors; or, put in another way, my interest is to answer the question: did the man receive a fair trial? "Trial," of course, means the whole process, from arrest to sentence.

I have read the California rebuttals, and they leave me cold. That, of course, may be my fault, for one may whistle in vain to a milestone. But the California whistlers have whistled in vain to many others as well as to myself; to the members of the Wilson Mediation Commission, to John B. Densmore, who investigated the case for the Department of Labor, and to the Wickersham Commission. My brief quotations suffice to show that the case began in iniquity. I think that a careful reading of the report of the Section on Lawless Enforcement of Law will show that it also ended in iniquity.

While Mrs. Mooney's case is not here under review, a conversation between the district attorney and his assistant shows better than long argument, I think, the spirit which energized the prosecution. When Mr. Densmore was investigating the case for President Wilson, a dictaphone was placed in the district attorney's office, and this conversation was caught.

Cunha: Chief, if you can get a witness who will put Mrs. Mooney at Steuart and Market Streets, I don't give a damn if you put her there in a balloon.

Fickert: I think I can put her there in a taxicab. It looks as though we have the witness.

Cunha: If you have, Chief, I will put that [unprintable language] Mrs. Mooney on trial again, and I will convict her by every rule of the game.

Passing over the curious methods used to "identify" Mooney and other of the prisoners, a few remarks on the hearings are in order. It has often been alleged that Mooney received a fair hearing, or at least, that its outcome did him no injustice, because his guilt was evident. That is simply Alice in Wonderland law—sentence first, trial afterwards. My impression of the witnesses and their testimony coincides with that of the Section.

Summing up the whole problem with regard to the witnesses produced at the trial, and the character of their testimony, we find that the basic witnesses to events occurring in broad daylight, in or near crowded streets, were these and these only: McDonald, a syphilitic and a psychopathic liar; Crowley, a syphilitic whose testimony, when defending himself unsuccessfully against prosecution, was condemned by the judge that tried his case; Oxman, who testified falsely, and who signed letters whose clear effect was to induce another to do the same thing; Mrs. Edeau, who was a victim of hallucinations, and whose testimony was demonstrably false; Sadie Edeau, whose testimony follows her mother's and falls with it; Estelle Smith, a prostitute, with a police record.

Limitations upon my space prevent comment on the conduct of the witnesses. But I am particularly anxious, in view of their importance, to transcribe the general conclusions reached by the Section.

1. There was never any scientific attempt made by either the police or the prosecution to discover the perpetrators of the crime. The investigation was in reality turned over to a private detective who used his position to cause the arrest of the defendants. The police investigation was reduced to a hunt for evidence to convict the arrested defendants.

2. There were flagrant violations of the statutory law of California by both the police and the prosecution in the manner in which the defendants were arrested and held incommunicado, and in the subsequent searches of their homes to procure evidence against them.

3. After the arrest of the defendants, witnesses were brought to the jails to "identify" them, and their "identifications" were accepted by the police, despite the fact that these witnesses were never required to pick the defendants out of a line-up, or to demonstrate their accuracy by any other test.

4. Immediately after the arrest of the defendants there commenced a deliberate attempt to arouse public prejudice against them, by a series of almost daily interviews given to the press by the prosecuting officials.

5. Witnesses were produced at the trials with information in the hands of the prosecution that seriously challenged the credibility of the witnesses, but this information was deliberately concealed.

6. Witnesses were permitted to testify at the trials, despite such knowledge in the possession of the prosecution of prior contradictory stories told by these witnesses, as to make their mere production a vouching for perjured testimony.

7. Witnesses were coached in their testimony to a degree that approximated subornation of perjury. There is a strong inference that some of this coaching was done by prosecuting officials, and other evidence points to a knowledge by the prosecuting officials that such coaching was being practised on other witnesses.

8. The prejudice against the defendants, stimulated by newspaper publicity, was further appealed to at the trials by unfair and intemperate arguments to the jury in the opening and closing statements of the prosecuting attorneys.

9. After the trials, the disclosures casting doubt on the justice of the convictions were minimized, and every attempt made to defeat the liberation of the defendants, by a campaign of misrepresentation and propaganda carried on by the officials who had prosecuted them.

Evidence for those conclusions is given in satisfying detail. It may not make your flesh creep, but if you hate cruelty, and abominate the revolting blasphemy which turns our courts, by supposition the visible manifestations of the justice and mercy of the Divine Legislator, into instruments of oppression, then it will make your blood boil.

WHICH?

Which am I, God . . . the dull, prosaic me
That talks to you at night when no one hears?
Or am I that
Loquacious, silly, chattering me that sings
Of everything . . . that scribbles useless rhymes
About a star;
A me that swears to do unheard-of things
There in the dark, and then forgets,
When morning comes,
That heaven ever held such things as stars?
God, which am I?

HELEN L. LOWREY.

Back of Business

READERS of AMERICA have written in, sending programs and pamphlets regarding a solution of our present economic dilemma. It is gratifying to see that sometimes these suggestions are coming in at the rate of three a week. It is gratifying because it shows that many readers are not satisfied with what they read in newspapers and magazines, but do some thinking of their own. But this obviously is not the sole cause. Another reason lies in the fact that it is so easy to solve the depression—on paper.

It is this latter reason which tempts many of these authors not only to help us out of the hole of this depression but to try for permanent prosperity. This is going very far, indeed, especially in view of the fact that I do not recall any one period in the history of mankind, either economic, social, or political, where there has been any such thing as "permanency." The unfolding of history is invariably a picture of ups and downs. With what right do we expect then to build permanently in the future? With no right whatever! Neither has mankind shown itself "permanent" in any sort of endeavor, nor has any individual (with very rare exceptions) adhered to a "permanent" attitude, outlook, or behavior. For the individual attitude changes with changing conditions. I have no hesitancy to say that most authors of depression-solving pamphlets could readily test the truth of this law on their own behavior in the depression of today as contrasted with their behavior in times of prosperity.

While it is easy to "prove" in good times that prosperity is "permanent," while it is easy to "prove" in bad times how prosperity can be made "permanent," it is mighty hard to explain just why it wouldn't work—unless one is willing to consider the peculiar workings of human behavior. However, once we include the human aspect in our theories, then it is not difficult at all to explain that in prosperity we want no changes because of our *hope* to gain more; that in depression we are anxious for changes because of our *fear* to lose more.

I had often said in this column that in this depression we are not facing an economic but a human problem. I want to state it once more. Clearly, if we want to get rid of misguided principles, we have to consider the human aspect; we have to control the excesses of individual effort, ambition, desire; we have to curb individualism. The problem is this: How can we interfere with this human trait on which every bit of progress, every idea, every ideal, every sacrifice, faith, and motive are based, without destroying these beautiful fruits on the tree of human nature?

It is the pivotal point in the mass of economic (and human) problems. Incidentally, it is the one point which is, with great consistency, neglected in the best-intentioned programs that come to my desk.

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD.

With Scrip and Staff

AS soon as the skiff appeared around the bend in the river, I felt instinctively that I was in for a conversation. Pulling the oars was a bent old man, whose eyes were fixed upon me as he approached, pushed his tiny craft upon the muddy shore, and wearily lifted out his limbs. Unshaven for weeks, and, apparently, unwashed for months, he belonged more to the river bottom than to human society. However, he soon showed signs of being a philosopher. "Thomas Dwyer is my name," he replied, with a touch of inherited brogue, to my questioning: "born up at Irish Bluffs, back of them hills: son of an Irish father and a German mother."

Like the Evangelist St. John, he was careful to fix time and place before further discourse. "You understand," he continued, "that that is Dutchman's Mess, and that is Pig Pen Point." Just *what* was Dutchman's Mess I did not grasp, since all I could see in that direction was a revolving rack with old fishnets rolled on it, and a dilapidated Ford upon the shore. "Now I have been here all my life."

"And you have seen many changes?" was the inevitable response to that versicle.

"Lord, yes. Did you ever hear of the town of St. Louis?"

"Once upon a time I think I did hear of it."

"Well, 'tis away down the river. There was a time when the grand steamers came up from St. Louis. They came by the hundreds; they ran on schedule; and they came right through the channel here. Sometimes there were as many as forty a day. But now they are all gone. Nothing now do you ever see on the river but just a barge or two in a dog's age; or once in a while an excursion boat in the summer time. 'Tis the strangest thing in the world."

THE disappearance of all that river traffic would have been the strangest thing in the world. At least it might have been the strangest thing in *his* world, if one had looked upon it from the limited viewpoint of old Tom Dwyer (I was about to say "poor old Tom Dwyer," but rumor had it that the old man had saved substantially for his bank account what he spared from the barber and tailor). A few days later the story did not seem so strange, when, while crossing the same river on the bridge, I recalled the famous "Effie Afton" case, won by Abraham Lincoln in 1857, which, it is said, was decisive in turning the tide of traffic from the Mississippi River to the railroads. So when Tom first paddled his infant toes in the mud, the strange event had already begun, though it was many a year before it had reached such a stage as to impress his imagination.

Since then I have wondered what else might be called the strangest thing in the world. Are there not many other matters which are lying behind the events of the times, but are passing unheeded from their very strange-

ness? Today, for instance, the imagination is captured by the sight of two of the greatest debates of our period. One of these debates is between the nations of the West, across the blue Atlantic, and it involves all the problems of covenanted peace. The other, across the Yellow Sea, and across the polished tables of the League of Nations Council chamber, is conducted to the rumblings of distant war. Yet how much heed is paid to the strange factors that lie behind the War-debts discussions, and the Chinese-Japanese controversy over Manchuria: the munitions industry in the Western world, the drug industry in the East?

ONCE in a while some inkling of this sort of thing reaches the public. According to the *Japan Advertiser*, of September 21, 1932:

The Manchukuo Government has promulgated provisional regulations governing the purchase of opium by government officials and other authorized persons from the general public. This step was taken preparatory to the adoption of an opium-monopoly system, for which a Committee will be appointed to make all necessary preparations.

This is, of course, a convenient method of maintaining order in troubled Manchuria. Drugged Chinese are quiet Chinese; opium will accomplish what heroin, morphine, and cocaine may have left undone.

At the last session dealing with opium, of the Fifth Committee (on humanitarian questions) of the League of Nations, at which fifty Governments were represented and only seven, I understand, had anything to say, the Chinese delegate, Hoo Chi Tsai, objected to the various nations "passing the buck," to use a colloquial but expressive phrase. In other words, he refuted the charge, made at the earlier Bangkok opium conference, that smuggling into their territories prevented other Governments from suppressing their legal sales of smoking opium.

How profitable these sales are appears from the simple fact that in ten years more than 2,500,000,000 gold francs (about \$98,000,000) net revenue have been derived from the sale of smoking opium by Governments under pledge to suppress it. There are Governments who actually lend opium pipes to "the poorest class of smokers who could not afford to have their own opium pipes or had no homes wherein to smoke." We speak of "advanced nations," and look with dread upon the yellow immigrant. Yet the sordid scandal of the sale of opium for smoking to native labor in the Asiatic Far East still persists, despite the obligations assumed by the Governments, at The Hague, in 1912, to suppress opium smoking.

One thing appears sacrosanct through it all: the legal traffic in drugs. From the *Journal de Genève*, of September 24, 1932, we learn that the German Government opposed the publication of the report of the Permanent Opium Committee (a group of experts, not Government delegates), on the plea that it might cause some inconvenience for the legal trade in drugs. A draft Limitation Convention was signed by the delegates of the various Governments on July 13, 1932. Most of the Govern-

ments, through their delegates, have promised to ratify the convention before the year is up; but no money has yet been voted for carrying it out.

The American State Department, in a press release of November 28, 1931, made plain its view that the apparently hopeless conflict between Government monopolies and irrepressible smuggling could allow of only one effective solution for the whole problem, that of limiting the actual growth of drug crops.

Until the efforts to limit and control poppy cultivation meet with success, constant vigilance will be called for to combat the illicit traffic; and the experience gained from the attempt to suppress opium smoking gradually through the monopoly system is regarded by the American Government as indicating that neither the existence nor the danger of smuggling would justify a departure from the policy of absolute proscription.

Happily for our own peace of mind: "The American Government met its obligations under the Hague Convention through legislation which effectively prohibits the manufacture, importation, transportation, or sale of smoking opium both at home and in its possessions, including the Philippine Islands." Knowing this, our hearts may not be quite so keenly wrung by some of the shafts which are being aimed at us from abroad for our War-debts policy.

PURSUING this line of thought, I find a still stranger thing: the immunity of the munitions trade. The Covenant of the League of Nations indicted this trade as "open to grave objections," and decreed:

The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

Yet the trade goes on. Clarence K. Streit, the New York Times Geneva correspondent, gives us a few figures based on official reports. For 1930, the exports in the arms trade for fifty-nine countries totaled \$55,000,000; the imports only \$49,000,000, leaving at least \$6,000,000 unaccounted for, in the interests of military secrecy. In the year 1930, the latest for which statistics are yet available, Great Britain stood first with 30.8 per cent of the trade; France with 12.9 per cent; the United States with 11.7 per cent.

Munitions making is not to be sneezed at. The Allies paid the business \$2,351,000,000 for only part of their war material during the twenty months we were in the War. The debt payments to us, principal and interest, amount to date to \$2,606,000,000. "The munitions business is, then, capable in time of war of getting in cash in less than two years about as much as the United States, at great political if not economic cost, can collect from the rest of the world in thirteen years." Moreover it is a growing business. The dividends of the Skoda works have been steadily rising: from five per cent in 1920, to 28½ per cent in 1929 and 1930. As is well known, the Skoda, Schneider-Creuzot, Krupp, and other large European munition works are now consolidated.

Statistics issued November 26 showed that France exported 6,892,000 francs' (about \$275,680) worth of

"arms, powder, and munitions in October of this year; or about \$5,280,000 worth in ten months." Under sharp questioning from the Communists, the Minister of War acknowledged the shipments had been made to both China and Japan. Premier Herriot expresses himself as favoring the State control of armament manufactures. But there is considerable difference between the mere expression of such a wish, and the actual grappling with the industrial giants.

THERE are, of course, plenty of other strange things. For instance, Colonel Robins turned up in the mountains of North Carolina, suffering from amnesia, the day that Father LaFarge's article on him appeared in our pages. There is also the strange fact that the Pope was once on United States territory, as the following Washington, D. C., item, dated November 7, relates:

One of 150 rosaries given to Catholic members of the crew of "Old Ironsides" by Pope Pius IX when he visited the famed frigate at Gaeta, Italy, on Aug. 2, 1848, was used yesterday during the recitation of the rosary aboard the historic vessel here.

The Rev. Thomas J. Knox, naval chaplain stationed at Quantico, Va., led in the recitation, and the Rev. Robert J. White, of the Catholic University, a midshipman during the War, preached.

The historic rosary is on exhibit in a glass case on "Old Ironsides." When Pope Pius IX visited the United States man-of-war eighty-three years ago, it marked the first time that a Pontiff ever set foot upon United States territory.

But none of these are stranger than what is going on behind the scenes of these two historic debates. The unshaven and unwashed are not always the most destitute. There must be considerable more plain speaking on the tabooed subject of monetary profit before commissions and conferences will accomplish much.

THE PILGRIM,

FRAGMENT 3

(Around the fair moon the bright beauty of the stars is lost them when her silver light illumines the world at its fullest.—Sappho.)

Just as the stars about
The full moon's silver light
Lack-lusterly grow dim,
Maids wither as with blight,

Dica, when your eyes smile.
Mnasidica the fair,
And dainty Gyrinno,
And Gongyla—all share

In Helen's magic spell.
(Yet Helen's self might fear
The beauty that is yours.)
Their graces disappear,

Like stars around the moon.
Like shadows when the sun
Has set, the men they charm
All leave them one by one

To place their burning love
Beside your chill disdain.
Be gracious, Dica dear,
The fullest moons must wane.

J. R. N. MAXWELL, S.J.

Literature

The Irish Academy of Literature

FRANCIS TALBOT, S.J.

ON the question, whether or not there should be an Irish Academy of Literature, there might be endless debate. Briefly, Ireland has managed very splendidly in literature without an Academy, and will undoubtedly continue to produce brilliant literature without any group organizations except such as meet informally in the Dublin drawing rooms and public houses. A proper Academy, however, such as that of the forty immortals of France, or that of Sweden, might be of some worth if two fundamental queries were answered correctly: first, would the Academy be of Gaelic literature or Anglo-Irish? second, if it were of Anglo-Irish literature (though one knows not what influence an Irish group would have in determining proper English usage) what is Anglo-Irish or Ireland-in-English literature at all?

An Irish Academy of Literature has been founded. The idea for it has been germinating in the dark places of the brain of William Butler Yeats for a number of years. He has spoken of it on occasions as a vision to be realized before he passed on to the vision that he does not consider too seriously. On a Sunday afternoon in the late September, he gathered together an audience in the Peacock Theater, Dublin, and with the help of Lennox Robinson, announced that he thereby created the Irish Academy of Literature. Due to the inaudibility of the speakers, and their unintelligibility when audible, Dublin suspected, but was not too sure, that the Academy had been evolved out of the aura of Mr. Yeats. Newspaper reports and press dispatches and some public correspondence proved without a doubt that Messrs. Yeats and Robinson had really brought the Academy into being in the Peacock Theater that Sunday afternoon. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Yeats came to the United States on a lecture tour. He talks of the Academy quite freely, and I suspect that he hopes to be able, on his return, to purchase shamrock wreaths to crown the Academy members, and the young authors whom he chooses to patronize.

Periodically in Ireland there arises the debate as to the nature of Irish literature written in English and as to the authenticity of certain so-styled Irish writers. Mr. Yeats, George Russell (A. E.), Lennox Robinson and other such writers, have, until the advent of the newer hoodlum school of writers, been accepted as the real authors of Ireland by the English-speaking literary world. In Ireland itself, however, they have been tolerated as Irish in profession and by accident of birth, but not as Irish-Irish. They are regarded as Anglo-Irish, as part of the Ascendancy, as a kind of Englishry transplanted in Ireland. The chief spokesman and exponent of the undiluted Irish literature, even though it is written in English, is Daniel Corkery, whose recent book, "Synge and Anglo-Irish Literature," states the case artistically and philosophically against the assumptions of the Yeats ascendancy in literature.

When, therefore, Mr. Yeats created an Irish Academy of Literature, he strove to perpetuate that spurious school of literature (though its authors wrote truly literary masterpieces) which has come to be accepted in our foreign lands of England and the United States as unhyphenated Irish literature. However, Mr. Yeats is not unpopular in Ireland; more than that, he is, as it were, an institution in himself, with large influence, highly respected, an arbiter of literary taste, and a genius. In any Academy of Literature in Ireland, Mr. Yeats would deserve to be named among the foremost, and most distinguished members. The Academy of Literature that he has attempted to form and which he has called Irish cannot, nevertheless, be considered any more seriously than a Dublin witticism.

In a letter sent to those chosen to be Academicians by Mr. Yeats and George Bernard Shaw, who has remained conspicuously silent on the whole affair, Mr. Yeats reveals: "We have no authority or mandate beyond the fact that the initiative has to be taken by somebody, and our age and the publicity which attaches to our names makes it easier for us than for younger writers." The assumption, of course, is that there must be an Irish Academy, and that it must be dominated by the Ascendancy writers, the Protestant, Anglo-Irish dictatorship of literature. Neither the Cosgrave nor the De Valera Governments would have aught to do with the project, as might be expected. Its sole authority would be the prestige of the creators. And these, as Ireland has always declared, are not true Irish. No more would such an Academy be representative of the new, autogenous Irish literature.

The real, and single reason alleged by Mr. Yeats for the formation of the Academy is alien to the almost universal Irish sentiment. In order to protect Irish readers from debauching and pornographic periodicals and books, there was passed by the Cosgrave Government legislation setting up a board of censorship on printed matters. This legislation was enthusiastically approved by the Fianna Fail party when it was the political opposition, and has been strictly enforced by President De Valera's party since it came into power. This sane and healthful censorship has been regarded with satisfaction by all the intelligent Irish except Mr. Yeats and his associates. They have combated it in Ireland, and have ridiculed it and exaggerated its alleged tyranny in the English and American press.

Against this governmental censorship, Mr. Yeats has launched his Irish Academy. In his letter to the prospective Academicians he states: "There is in Ireland an official censorship possessing, and actively exercising, powers of suppression which may at any moment confine an Irish author to the British and American market, and thereby make it impossible for him to live by distinctive Irish literature." This statement is a strange mixture of folly and mendacity. The official censorship has banned only those books which are odorously and steamingly immoral. With few exceptions, the books banned have been by authors foreign to Ireland. The few exceptions

of Irish authors whose work has been put on the blacklist are those who are an offense to all decent-minded people, Irish or not. Mr. Yeats, A. E., and the other respectable members of their group have had nothing to fear, in their own regard, from the official censorship. Their Academy, from the above statement, was created for the sole purpose of opening the gates to an immoral foreign literature and of giving facilities to two or three Irishmen to disseminate filth.

In promulgating his Academy, Mr. Yeats was guilty not only of meager logic but of atrociously bad taste. Perhaps he intended to be humorous, which would explain the bad taste. In his first announcement of the Academy, he, on his own authority and that of Mr. Shaw, made public the names of those selected to be Academy members. These authors, he stated, would learn of their election through the newspapers. They had not been consulted prior to his announcement; they would, he believed, not be altogether pleased with their selection; in fact, some would refuse the nomination and would, he expected, send him infuriated replies. Nevertheless, he named the twenty-five members of the Academy, and added ten others who were classified as associate members.

Mr. Yeats received the infuriated repudiation from the members that he said he expected. Daniel Corkery lost no time in giving his opinion of Mr. Yeats, his works, pomps, and lists. T. C. Murray would have none of it. James Joyce, for different reasons, begged to be excused. For other reasons, Lord Dunsany expressed his regrets. Sean O'Faolain was cold to it, Oliver St. J. Gogarty laughed at it, and Sean O'Casey was mordant about it. Not more than half a dozen of the twenty-five immortals were thankful for the crowns forced on their heads by Mr. Yeats.

Nor was there a pleasanter reception of the Yeats Academy in the newspapers and magazines of the United Kingdom and Ireland. Allan Monkhouse, writing in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, is in doubt as to whether it would "be right to suggest that this particular project must be taken seriously, very seriously—not too seriously." What impresses him most in the idea is the possibility of quarreling among the Academicians. "Irishmen can quarrel on a great scale. . . . And what glorious rows these forty Academicians will have! Perhaps not; but it would be melancholy if they settled down quietly to business."

In a more serious way, the *London Tablet* devoted its leader to a thoroughgoing, ruthless demolition of the Academy, Yeats, Shaw, and all the progenitors. It was "a real insult to Ireland," said the *Tablet*; it was "an impudent usurpation"; the list of Academicians includes authors of "base works utterly alien to the national morality"; and in a note on the refusal of Lord Dunsany to participate, it speaks of the "preposterous Irish Academy" and "of the off-hand insolence with which this affair has been conducted." The *London Month* also calls it "a preposterous body. It is meant to be a protest against the censorship of books. It might, indeed,

be styled a 'Protective Association for Emancipated Authors,' but it is not likely to meet with any support from Christian lovers of literature." The writer in the *Month* recalls that the idea of the Academy was mooted by Mr. Yeats last April, at which time he had mentioned "some obvious preliminary choices." In references to them, the *Month* stated:

These nominees of his include several writers whose attitude to truth, religion, and decency, as revealed in their writings, is a cause of shame to every Irish person who values the Christian tradition of the race. . . . If the proposed Academy is not to be the laughing stock of the nation from the start, members must be selected who may be trusted not to flout the ethical principles on which Irish civilization, and indeed all genuine culture, is based.

If the English Catholics speak thus of the Yeats-Shaw Academy, it may well be imagined what the Irish have said. Liam Gogan, in a lecture before the Dublin Writers' Club, described the Academy as composed of two groups, according to the N. C. W. C. News Service: these were "the hierophants representing the Ascendancy, as they even claimed, and a rank and file mostly made up of writers derived from the Gaelic camp who had dropped the traditional moral standards of Irish literature and in some cases of the traditional faith." What would appear to be the final word on the Academy was given by P. J. Gannon, S.J., who spoke on the subject in the Theater Royal in Dublin. He described the Academy as unwelcome and unauthorized. Still, in his opinion, there was nothing to prevent any body of writers from forming a mutual-admiration society and giving it any title that they pleased. Hence, Mr. Yeats and Mr. Shaw could have their Academy if they desired it. Nor should anyone lose his temper or his sense of humor over the affair. Father Gannon, with no loss of temper and with much humor, then proceeded to show that there was scarcely one aspect of the Academy that could be honestly accepted by your true Irishman of culture and intelligence.

REVIEWS

Mush, You Malemutes! By BERNARD R. HUBBARD, S.J. New York: The America Press. \$3.00.

A glorious book! Father Hubbard does not tell you about his trips, he takes you along with him over every foot of the way: on the boat; on the train; in the plane; behind those dogs, Mageik and Snookum, Pete and Warrior, and all the others that helped him win his goal. Up the snow-clad peaks we go and down into "the prelude of Hell" when the plane zoomed down only to be caught in the suction of the volcano's belching crater. We kneel with him as he says his "Hail Mary" just before each new great discovery, always restraining ourselves with him to thank God first for the wonders we are about to see. Aniakhak, Shishaldin, Bogoslof, we have visited them all, and have felt their terror and grandeur. That is Father Hubbard's gripping, thrilling, nerve-tensing gift of story telling. Scientist he is as he pauses to take temperature just eight inches under foot—1,080° Centigrade, or leans over to trap chlorine gas, not ever caught before from a volcano. But kindly, companionable too, as he neglects to scold Chisholm for dropping a valued camera down an abyss, and peels and eats of the orange that had frightened the little Aleut boy; kindly, too, when having done the last 100 miles to Holy Cross in a near-delirium from influenza, he insists on first putting his loved dogs away before he topples into bed. And when he has painted them indelibly on our memory by his pen sketches,

he flashes 187 of his marvelous pictures upon us. At once we recognize the very places to which we have traveled. Truly a glorious book: gloriously written, gloriously illustrated by the writer-scientist who is ever the priest, never missing his Mass though he may have munched 85 miles in 67 hours "practically without sleep," never failing to recite his breviary though he bends beneath his hundred-pound pack.

F. P. LEB.

Nebuchadnezzar. By G. R. TABOUI. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. \$5.00.

Though picturesque as fiction, this engaging sketch is almost a biography. Nebuchadnezzar, or Nabuchodonosor, known to Biblical history as the destroyer of David's dynasty, was the greatest of the Neo-Babylonian kings. Of the data available from records of his time and from excavation on the site of his capital, Mme. Tabouis makes apt and constructive use, as well as of similar testimony to earlier periods of Mesopotamian history. She devotes eleven chapters partly to pivotal events in the great conqueror's reign, and partly to the ordinary activities of his subjects. The result is a sketch of his life and achievements which reads like a series of short stories. They exhibit every phase of Babylonian life in the sixth century before Christ, the characters enacting their parts in scenes reconstructed from the lifeless records by a fertile but well-governed imagination. Candor is not wanting, so that much is described which can only elicit disgust; but if the completed picture is rather sobering than inspiring, its effect need not be the less wholesome for that. The translators (anonymous) produce a version which does not lose in interest, though its English is poor in places. An appendix of notes, making a full fourth of the volume, provides references and explanations of the sources drawn upon for the historical substance of the sketch. The chief impediment to solidity in the whole undertaking, often present to an attentive reader of the text, is made clearer in the notes; it is the scarceness of records certainly applicable to this one half-century, and the consequent need of pressing into service Assyrian and even older material, whose survival in Nabuchodonosor's time is by no means certain as yet. In her judgment of religious origins, Mme. Tabouis maintains a just and scholarly reserve towards the excesses of Pan-Babylonian speculation. Her conception of the Old Testament, however, is unhappily inspired by Renan, and issues in opinions and interpretations which we cannot recommend to any reader. Here and there in the notes some oddities of bias spoil the general impression of historical poise, as where the Jesuits of "two hundred years ago" are (with no sufficient explanation) exhibited as "the last great instance of a religious association engaged in trade." But blemishes of this type are rare, and the writer, excepting her very unsafe guidance in matters Biblical, shows herself both a discriminating student of ancient history and a gifted and skilful interpreter of its message.

W. H. McC.

The Italian Reformers. 1534-1564. By FREDERIC C. CHURCH. New York: Columbia University Press. \$5.00.

It has always been a little difficult for the "Italian Reformers" to get their due place in the historians' sun. In an age of Catholic reformers such as Contarini, Pole, Sadoletto, Caraffa, Cervini, and the early Jesuits, to mention no others, such men as Valdes, Vermigli, and Vergerio have seemed to many to be little more than emotional renegades. Their decent epitaph has been sought in the sad correspondence of their Catholic friends, like Vittoria Colonna, who wept for their tragic apostasy. Anglican historians, on the other hand, have been somewhat embarrassed to find, in the beginnings of their "national" religion, that aliens from Italy joined with aliens from Poland and Germany to compose, in part, the English Prayer Book. More recently, however, Catholic historians like Tacchi-Venturi in his first volume of the "Storia della Compagnia di Gesù" in Italy, and, of course, Pastor, have put Ochino and the others in a clearer perspective. The present work, on the non-Catholic side, continues this task of historical

rehabilitation. Mr. Church's study covers the middle years of the sixteenth century. He sketches the general background of religious conditions and Papal policy during the 'thirties and 'forties. Then follows the history of that tangled web and warp of religious writings, preachings, and policies in Italy and beyond the Alps. Mr. Church has based his narrative on a considerable research knowledge of the original documents of the period. This is not to say that he is always felicitous in gauging the temper of Catholic thought or in understanding the character of Catholic motives. There is, however, hardly ever a tone of religious bitterness, and seldom the evidence of lack of scholarship. Yet little *obiter dicta* such as "Lainez . . . the real author of the Constitutions" (of the Society of Jesus), or "the uncompromising moral earnestness displayed by Calvin's cohorts has no counterpart in the opportunism of their Catholic antagonists," make one wonder if the author has mastered the whole evidence. There are, in fact, some serious lacunae in the documentation. To take but one example: considering the very close relationship that existed between Reginald Pole and some of the "reformers," it is almost incredible that appeal should be made to the antiquated life of Pole by F. G. Lee, or to the slight undergraduate essay by K. B. MacFarlane, rather than to the voluminous and valuable correspondence edited by Quirini or even to the very valuable life in German by Zimmermann. It is only with these grave reserves that the present work may be welcomed as objective history.

G. G. W.

What's the Matter with New York. By NORMAN THOMAS and PAUL BLANSHARD. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

Here is a book frankly critical of political and social conditions in New York, and openly advocating genuine Socialism as the only cure for present-day unrest and depression. With the stark principles of Karl Marx, and the single-tax theory of Henry George, the co-authors of this book would impose cremation by city ordinance, and turn existing burial places into "parks for the living." In the opening chapters, one is impressed with the thought that here is a Daniel come to judgment, but as reading continues, a lurking suspicion hardens into a conviction that it is only "a pompous justice, full of wise saws and modern instances." After a sweeping condemnation of Tammany and all that name implies, the co-authors suddenly remember their true concern, and say flatly: "We propose to take away from speculative business the private profit which now causes corruption in city politics." With that purpose, a judicious mind would partially agree, for none deny the urgency of certain social reforms. But to substitute for our present government the disruptive program of Socialism, pure and simple, would be social and political suicide. Correction of abuses is desirable and necessary. Socialism is suicidal revolution. The book has several pages of references, an appendix, and an alphabetical index.

M. J. S.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Anthologies Revised.—Thomas Walsh's "The Catholic Anthology" (Macmillan. \$2.50), was hailed as a distinctive contribution to Catholic culture when it was published some five years ago. It has passed through several editions and has now reached the point where it was thought well that there should be additional poems and poets who were unwittingly neglected or who have since deserved recognition. No one was better fitted for this task than George N. Shuster who was associated with Mr. Walsh in the original compilation and who understood so intimately Mr. Walsh's purpose and basis of judgment. Most of the additional poems by Catholic and non-Catholic poets chosen by Mr. Shuster are well worthy of inclusion, and thus of preservation. There would seem, however, to be a slight differentiation between his selections and those in the other four sections of the anthology. This may be due either to Mr. Shuster or to the new type of poetry. The added poems would seem to be to stress the intellectual rather than the rhythmical, to be philosophic rather

than emotional. But in these poems as in all the others there is the sincerity of the soul speaking and the art of finished technique.

For many years "The Treasury of Irish Poetry" (Macmillan. \$3.00), edited by Stopford A. Brooke and T. W. Rolleston has been a real treasury of authentic poetry. A new edition of this volume, with additions, was also due. The original plan of the book has been adhered to. The new poets and their work have been added as book VII. These include the generation following that of the poets listed in book VI. They are not precisely of the latest generation, but of that which is fast passing out of existence. In a permanent treasury of Irish poetry such as this it is well that only those who have reached the heights be included.

Government.—In "Philippine Uncertainty" (Century. \$3.00) Senator Harry B. Hawes roundly scores our policy of procrastination toward a definite settlement of the Philippine question. The book is a stirring appeal for Philippine independence. The Filipinos all desire it, argues the Senator; they are capable of administering it; we have solemnly promised it to them; and we are injuring both our own and their interests in further delaying the fulfillment of that promise. Hence his plea that America write a declaration of independence for the first Christian republic in the Far East, allowing a period of probation somewhat longer than five years, yet less than ten, for the adjustment of economic and political dislocations. His chapter on Trade and Finance summarizes the arguments for and against independence and contains some valuable information regarding Filipino-American economic relations.

Prof. Frank Abbott Magruder, in his 1932 revision and enlargement of recent editions of his book, "American Government" (Allyn and Bacon), gives the high-school classes in civics a comprehensive work of 721 pages showing numerous maps, charts, diagrams, and photographs to help visually the understanding of the text. The chapters are supplemented with questions on the text and material for discussion.

Sociology.—"The Problem of Machinery," by C. T. B. D. (Distributive League. Sixpence), is a well-written pamphlet. The menace, according to the writer, is not in machinery but in its ownership by a few industrial magnates as against a host of independent owners. This point is well taken.

"Problems of Peace," (Oxford University Press. \$2.50), is a collection of lectures delivered at the Geneva Institute of International Relations, August, 1931. The Geneva Institute is an independent organization for the study of International Relations. The contributors to this, the sixth series, are, as in the past, men of authority in their field. This volume of proceedings contains twelve lectures, among them being the World Community in its relations to Public Opinion, to Europe, Russia, America, the British Empire, and to Labor. Prof. Paul Douglas gives us, as is his custom, a well-reasoned, clear, and practical paper. His subject is unemployment and its reduction through international cooperation. All lectures are characterized by their clarity and objectivity and their freedom from bias. This is notably the case in Dr. Sherwood's paper, "Russia and the World Community."

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

FABIAN. Erich Kästner. \$2.50. Dodd, Mead.
GOLDEN TALES OF THE PRAIRIE STATES. May Lamberton Becker. \$2.50. Dodd, Mead.
GOSPEL IN ACTION, THE. Paul R. Martin. \$2.50. Bruce.
MURDER OF THE LAWYER'S CLERK. J. S. Fletcher. \$2.00. Knopf.
OF FAMILIAR INTERCOURSE WITH GOD IN PRAYER. Ven. Louis de Ponte, S.J. Benziger.
PALESTINE, LAND OF THE LIGHT. Frederick DeLand Leete. \$2.50. Houghton Mifflin.
ROMAN PONTIFICAL, THE. Dom Pierre de Puniet, O.S.B. \$3.50. Longmans, Green.
SHERMAN: FIGHTING PROPHET. Lloyd Lewis. \$3.50. Harcourt, Brace.
SIR BERTRAM WINDLE. Monica Taylor, S.N.D. \$4.00. Longmans, Green.
THRILLS OF A NATURALIST'S QUEST. Raymond L. Ditmars. \$3.50. Macmillan.
TWENTIETH CENTURY NOVEL, THE. Joseph Warren Beach. \$3.50. Century.
WOMEN AGAINST MEN. Storm Jameson. \$2.50. Knopf.

Christmas and Twelfth Night. The Living Voice. Mario and the Magician. The Trunk-Call Mystery. The Life and Adventures of Aloysius O'Callaghan.

All of the six short chapters of "Christmas and Twelfth Night" (Longmans, Green. \$1.00), by Sigrid Undset, turn about the Babe of Bethlehem. They are not, as one might think, the narrative retelling of the incidents of the Birth and Childhood Mysteries. Nor are they fictionized stories that follow the Gospel revelations. They are the matured thoughts of the serious novelist and the ardent philosopher on the contemporary world in relation to the spiritual world which Jesus came, as a small Child, to found. In mood, they are not unlike the papers of that other distinguished novelist, Sheila Kaye-Smith, in her "Mirror of the Months." These pages glow with the imagination of the novelist and are firmly founded on the hard theology of true Catholicism. The volume is beautifully illustrated.

In "The Living Voice" (Benziger. \$2.00) Agnes M. Blundell has written, in a very charming manner, an historical novel dealing with the grim horrors of Seventeenth-century civil war in England. The bitterness of war and religious persecution is somewhat relieved by the presence of a simple and beautiful romance between Simon Bradshaigh and Ann Cottington. Throughout the entire story, the heroic loyalty of the priesthood, even to martyrdom, and the dramatic conversion of the Protestant Earl of Derby, Lord Strange, culminating in his ultimate betrayal and impeachment, are skilfully interwoven against the background of a strife-torn country. The author has produced an interesting book in accordance with the best traditions of the historical novel.

Thomas Mann, the famous German novelist, winner of the Nobel Prize of 1929, displays extraordinary skill in this macabre murder story, "Mario and the Magician" (Knopf. \$1.50), the scene of which is laid in an Italian summer resort. A hypnotist, posing as a juggler, gives a performance one evening before a large holiday crowd. From its midst he singles out Mario, a waiter, and so probes the man's innermost thoughts that Mario in a fury kills his tormentor. While the brief tale is gripping and holds the attention of the reader to the very end, it is not one to be recommended, because of its undue emphasis of the grisly and horrible. The translation from the German by H. T. Lowe-Porter is superbly done.

J. Jefferson Farjeon seems to consider the old Cooper formula—flight and pursuit—amply sufficient for any number of detective novels. His latest, "The Trunk-Call Mystery" (Dial. \$2.00), utilizes the same tenuous theme. As usual, this Farjeon story opens and continues for half the book with unknown people running after unknown people for unknown reasons. In the middle of the novel the faint plot reveals itself. A thief has been wounded and an altruistic young maiden remains faithful to the end. Mr. Farjeon has salted the thin story with two unpalatable bits of morality. The heroine tells us that she would remain "engaged" to a married man even though she knew he was married. The hero is of the modern school of philosophy that holds: "It's no credit to me that I don't pocket the spoons on this table. My particular chemistry isn't attracted to pocketing other people's spoons."

One finds it delightful to read but difficult to analyze "The Life and Adventures of Aloysius O'Callaghan" (Morrow. \$2.50) by Thomas Washington-Metcalf. From a literary standpoint it is, in places, atrocious—but its moral teachings are irreproachable. Within its pages are condensed all the raw crudities of a London Mid-Victorian penny dreadful, together with the more sophisticated excitement of a shilling shocker. The suspense, too, of our own Mid-Western Diamond Dick series is cunningly interwoven with the ingenuity and thrills found in such classics as "Alice in Wonderland" and "Robinson Crusoe." There is also a wealth of new and original incidental surprises, not the least of which is a serious, though short, sermon. A most unexpected conclusion closes the book, with the cryptic letters "A.M.D.G.," the symbolic formula of the Jesuit's purpose in life. Even a hurried or only occasional reader will find both entertainment and instruction in this book.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Catholics and Socialistic Doctrines

To the Editor of AMERICA:

There has recently been called to my attention a query from Rochester, N. Y., published in your correspondence column for October 1 as to the Catholic position in regard to Socialistic doctrines. Statements made in a government class by a Catholic instructor, a graduate of the Catholic University of America, were given as the basis for a contention that a Catholic may be a Socialist. As the instructor referred to, I feel it incumbent upon me to clarify that statement in order that no opinions be attributed to me which are contrary to the authoritative pronouncements of the Church.

In a somewhat lengthy discussion of governmental forms, I made the incidental statement that the Catholic Church, as a matter of practical politics, has adapted itself, and can continue to adapt itself, to any form of government *provided, of course, that the basic theory underlying a particular government is not mutually exclusive of Catholic dogma.* Upon questioning, I elaborated that statement by saying that Catholicism might conceivably exist in a Socialistic or a Communistic State. I was speaking of Socialism and Communism in their purely political aspects, and presupposing their basis as resting upon a theory that would admit the existence of a Being superior to the State. The type of Socialism and Communism with which we are familiar in present-day Europe was automatically excluded by my distinction. My explanations were apparently satisfactory to all members of a rather mature class with the exception of the student whose letter you published. She desired further elucidation, which I attempted to supply, evidently with little success.

My contention was, and is, that a Catholic may cooperate politically with a group or an individual who supports Socialistic doctrines not inconsistent with or exclusive of fundamental Catholic belief, such a group, for example, as that led by Hughes, Maurice, and Kingsley in England. I am quite aware, of course, that the group named is not considered by the Catholic Encyclopedia as Socialist properly so-called, but rather as "Christian Socialist" improperly labeled. In precisely the same way I believe Norman Thomas does not represent Socialism as condemned by Leo XIII. The inclusiveness of the word *Socialism* is a question of the definition of terms. Having supplied my answer to that question, I believe that Thomas may be supported by a Catholic in accordance with the words of Leo XIII: "In matters merely political, as for instance the best form of government, and this or that system of administration, a difference of opinion is lawful."

Washington.

JOHN J. MENG.

[The writings of Norman Thomas leave little doubt that he advocates true Socialism. He has also admitted that his Socialism differs from Communism solely in the matter of the method of achieving the same end. Besides that, his support of the recognition of Russia, of birth control, and of cremation, for instances, make Catholic support of him highly dangerous.—Ed. AMERICA.]

"The Word and the Accent"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The letter of A. L. M., Florida, on "The Word and the Accent," suggests this one. As on the sick list lately, I attended a church of this Archdiocese that was holding a novena, and listened to four priests. I hope that they, as well as other priests, will read these lines, written solely as a constructive criticism. The preachers had fine presence, ample voice, good material to deliver, no doubt, and were native born. In the rear of the church, I got tired trying to follow three of them, and noticed that others

had fallen asleep. None of them talked more than fifteen minutes, and at the Communion rail. They moved their heads too frequently from side to side, and swallowed sentences, especially toward their endings. They seemed not to know much about sound waves, or grace of gesture, and surely little about the right of every auditor before them to get all that they said without any difficulty. If they did, no one would have slept. There are no moron congregations as such, but these preachers are morons, at least inasmuch as they do not pay sufficient attention to the proper deliverance of even a short talk or sermon. . . .

More attention should be paid in our seminaries to the deliverance of sermons, and not to the subject matter alone. If priests would sit at the rear of the church, and listen to their confreres preaching, and then tell them of the experience afterwards, a change to the good would follow. The undersigned has done so quite often, and was thanked by his associates. There is not one of those four priests who could not make a fine preacher in a short time—and all were young. What is said here about preaching applies equally to the reading of church notices at the Sunday Masses. Not every rector would have them mimeographed and distributed at the Masses to be taken home by the parishioners, yet it was done in one church in Pittsburgh. You may infer the correct—why?

Bronx, N. Y.

LISTENER.

Social Justice? Hurry Up!

To the Editor of AMERICA:

What we have been waiting for, what should have been done years ago, but what at last has been done within the past few days has happened. And that is, the National Catholic Alumni Federation's conference to discuss the present deplorable conditions and, better still, to remedy them.

We are told that they adopted a resolution for a national conference of Catholic economists to frame a definite platform and place it before the nation's leaders, and demand that its provisions be enacted into law. Fine! But let us implore them to hurry. We have had too much petty party politics, and lots of talking in circles. We have been waiting a long, long time for someone to champion human rights and get some action, and now look hopefully for results from this conference. But hurry!

Teaneck, N. J.

JAMES WATERS.

The Art of Abram Ryan

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your issue for October 22, 1932, brings an article "Catholicism Inspires Art" by a certain critic.

His reference toward the end of the article to Father Abram J. Ryan, the Poet-Priest, is altogether unfortunate and unjust. Let us hope that he will see his mistake and make amends. It will benefit your esteemed weekly to have unbiased critics write your articles, as well as bring profit to the literary world.

The critic refers to art in one of the leading paragraphs as "a means of expressing the hunger of the human spirit for the Divine." Now if one does not find this in Father Ryan's poetry, one must be altogether blind and dumb. The critic wails about sentimentality and false feeling. More's the pity that our critic, and a Catholic at that, cannot fathom the sublime sentiments and momentous "feeling" of a poet-priest interpreting the Law of God to the modern rationalistic world. Such a one should not single out a popular idol of the last fifty years and hold him up to scorn—it is like taking the Bread of Life away from the modern world—misfortune in the extreme.

Father Ryan emphasizes the great realities of time and eternity, the great truths of our holy Faith, and the ebb and flow of the human heart in its hunger for the Divine perhaps better than any other of our modern poets. Contrast if you will Kipling's poetry—which I think must be stamped as of the earth—how much more refreshing it is for an intelligent and spiritual being to delve into this love of the hunger for the Divine which is to be found in Father Ryan's poetry.

Marienthal, Kans.

R. RYAN.